

I ESDRAS

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. PRELIMINARY ACCOUNT OF THE BOOK.

THE first book of the Apocrypha stands in a class by itself in that it is, with the exception of one portion, a somewhat free Greek version of the biblical history from Josiah's Passover (2 Chron. xxxv.) to the Reading of the Law by Ezra (Neh. viii.). It differs, however, in several important particulars both from the corresponding canonical passages and from the more literal Greek translation of them (also preserved in the Septuagint), and an adequate treatment of its text and contents belongs properly to the commentaries and handbooks on Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Consequently, in order to keep the Introduction and Notes within limits, it has seemed desirable to print the Revised Version of the 'apocryphal' and 'canonical' passages side by side, and to restrict all remarks to those points which appeared to be essential for the study of the relation between the texts and their significance for the period which they cover. Further reference to the commentaries and other works dealing with the period in question is therefore recommended.

The contents of 1 Esdras comprise:—

- E* i.¹ = 2 Chron. xxxv. 1-xxxvi. 21. Josiah's passover and death; the last kings of Judah to the fall of Jerusalem, 586 B.C.
ii. 1-15. = *E* i. The decree of Cyrus permitting the rebuilding of the Temple and the return of Sheshbazzar with the temple-vessels and a band of exiles, 538-537.
ii. 16-30. = *E* iv. 7-24. The Samaritan opposition to the rebuilding in the reign of Artaxerxes. 465-425.
iii. 1-v. 6. wanting in *E*. The successful oration of Zerubbabel, one of the bodyguard of *Darius*, in the second year of his reign (*D*. I, Hystaspes, 521-486), and the king's decree permitting a return of exiles to rebuild the city and Temple; brief statement of the journey.
v. 7-73. = *E* ii. 1-iv. 5, 24 (*v*. 6 is wanting). List of Zerubbabel's band, the rebuilding of the Temple hindered by the Samaritans from the time of *Cyrus* to the second year of *Darius* (520).
vi.-vii. = *E* v. -vi. The successful rebuilding of the Temple through the intervention of *Darius* in 520, and its completion in 516.
viii. 1-ix. 36 = *E* vii. x. The decree of Artaxerxes in his seventh year (478), the return of Ezra and a body of exiles, the separation of the people from the foreign wives.
ix. 37-55 = *N* vii. 73-viii. 13 *a*. The reading of the law by Ezra, placed in *N L.c.* after the return of Nehemiah in the king's twentieth year (444).

The outstanding features are:—

- (1) The presence of the Artaxerxes record before the reign of *Darius*, whether after the return of Sheshbazzar (*E* ii. 16-30) or after the commencement of the rebuilding by Zerubbabel (*E* iv. 7-24), both of which are placed in the time of *Cyrus*.
- (2) The inclusion of *E* iii. 1-v. 6, the story famous for the Praise of Truth and the well-known dictum 'magna est veritas et praevalet', and the decree of *Darius* (which excludes any prior return).
- (3) The confusion caused by the presence of this section (*E* iii. 1-v. 6) in the history of the exiles who returned in the time of *Cyrus* (*E* ii. 1-15 = *E* i) and at once commenced the work of rebuilding (*E* v. 7-73 = *E* ii.-iv.).
- (4) The omission in *E* of *N* i.-vii. 72, with the result that the continuation of the story of Ezra (*N* viii.) is placed in immediate connexion with *E* vii.-x., whereas the canonical books leave a gap of twelve years between *E* vii.-x. and *N* i. seqq.
- (5) Numerous readings in *E* of greater or less value, which are often important for the textual criticism of the MT, and sometimes affect the literary and historical problems of the sources.
E ceases abruptly; cf. the close of 2 Chron., 'and let him go up' (= *E* i. 3), also Mark xvi. 8. The R.V. rendering of ix. 55 implies that this is intentional (so Ewald, Bissell, Lupton, Bayer, and others). Hence it is often supposed that *E* is a self-contained work, written and compiled for some

¹ For the abbreviations *E*, *E*, *N*, &c., see below, p. 19 seq.

I ESDRAS

specific purpose, e.g. to influence Gentiles in favour of the Jews, or (Lupton) to prepare the way for the building of the temple of Onias at Alexandria, or simply, perhaps, to bring together narratives relating to the Temple; cf. the conclusion of \mathfrak{L}^c 'explicit Esdrae liber primus de templi restitutione'. But the feature may also be explained on the view that the book, which begins somewhat abruptly, is merely a fragment of a larger work (Michaelis, Eichhorn, Trendelenburg, Rödiger, Treuenfels, Howorth, Torrey, and others). This raises several interesting questions; in particular, ix. 38-55 belong in N viii. to the concluding chapters of Ezra's history, and it is very noteworthy that Josephus finishes his account of Ezra before his introduction of Nehemiah—what was the original sequel of *E*? Moreover, not only was *E* used by this orthodox Jewish historian, the book was important enough to find a place in the Greek Bible, it was known to early Christian writers, and is referred to in terms which indicate that its canonicity and value were not doubtful (see § 2).

Now, the criticism of the O.T. has advanced sufficiently to prove that the biblical records E-N bristle with the most intricate and serious difficulties, the extent of which is manifest in the widely-differing conclusions that prevail. As can be seen from other sources (see § 4, iv. c), the history of the Persian period is plunged in obscurity, upon which some light has only recently been shed by contemporary records (Babylonian inscriptions, Jewish-Aramaic papyri from Upper Egypt). It can no longer be assumed that the MT necessarily represents a more trustworthy record of the age, and that *E* is necessarily arbitrary and methodless. Both share fundamental imperfections. *E*, therefore, in any case deserves impartial consideration, and its problems involve those of E-N. These problems, owing to the absence of decisive and independent evidence, can be handled only provisionally; but enough is clear to permit the conclusion that *E* represents a text in some respects older than the present MT, to which, however, some attempt seems to have been made to conform it (cf. Ewald, 138 n. 6; Howorth, *PSBA*, xxiii. 306 seq.). From a comparison of both with Jos. and other sources (notably Daniel) it would further appear that *E* represents one of the efforts to give an account of a period, the true course of which was confused and forgotten, if not intentionally obscured: different attempts were made to remove difficulties and inconsistencies, and the desire to give greater prominence to the priestly Ezra than to the secular governor Nehemiah is probably responsible for the arrangement of the extant texts.

E-N and *E* (with Jos.) exhibit diverging views of the history. But *E*, even in its present incomplete form, overlaps with Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, and since it provides a distinctly paraphrastic and free rendering of the MT, it seems probable that when it was superseded by the more literal Greek translation—of Theodotion (cf. the two Greek texts of Daniel)—this confused and self-contradictory book (or fragment) was preserved mainly on account of the excellent story of Zerubbabel (cf. Howorth, *PSBA*, xxiv. 167). To the Jews, both Zerubbabel and Nehemiah pale before the growing majesty of Ezra: to the early Christians, the Praise of Truth was a familiar passage, and Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, xviii. 36) saw in it a prophecy of Christ.¹ Dating, apparently, about the first century B.C., *E*'s view of history was familiar to Josephus and his readers, to the Hellenist Jews, and to the Christians. The form in E-N, with the omission of the story of Zerubbabel (and the chronological confusions which attend it), represents that of the Rabbinical schools, and subsequently (through Jerome) of the Christian Church. Through these vicissitudes *E* fell into unmerited neglect, and by this omission (apparently intentional) there was removed a story which could not fail to interest the Christians—for it is surely significant that although the two genealogies of Jesus are hopelessly inconsistent, the two lines of ancestry of 'David's greater Son' converge in the person of Zerubbabel.

§ 2. TITLE AND STANDING.

The book is known as (1) Esdras A or 1 Esdras, so \mathfrak{G}^{sa} , \mathfrak{L} , \mathfrak{S} , and English Bibles since the Geneva edition of 1560 (where the name 'Ezra' is reserved for the canonical book); or (2) as Esdras B or 2 Esdras, so \mathfrak{G}^t (where 1 Es. = Ezra and Nehemiah); or (3) as 3 Esdras, so Latin Bibles since Jerome, the 'Great Bible' of 1539, and also the Anglican Article VI in the Prayer-book. The name 3 *Paralipomenon* (i.e. Chronicles) is found in a Florentine Greek MS., cf. the title *Sermones Dierum* (the Heb. title of Chron.) *Esdrae* in Hilary's list (H. B. Swete, *Introd. to O.T. in Greek*, 210). It is also styled *Tertius Neeumiae* by Franciscus Robles, 1532 (Lupton, 4). A convenient name for the book is the 'Greek Ezra', to distinguish it from the other and literal translation of the canonical books.²

¹ A late Midrash (Jellinek, ii. 34-7) makes Zerubbabel the centre of 'a short apocalypse on the certainty of the ultimate appearance of the Messiah son of David, on his precursor the Messiah son of Joseph, and on their friends and foes' (Ew. 128).

² On the title *δ' ἐσδρας* in \mathfrak{G}^t (to distinguish *E* from 2 or 4 Esdras of the Apocrypha?), see Nestle, 29.

INTRODUCTION

It is a significant fact that, as emphasized by Whiston in 1722, the Jewish historian Josephus uses *E* for his account of King Josiah, follows its order of events, and is influenced by its language, although for the other books he employs the LXX. Equally significant is the appearance of *E* with the canonical E-N in the best Greek MSS., either before (\mathfrak{S}^{BA} , and presumably \mathfrak{N}) or after (\mathfrak{S}) these. It is quoted by several early Greek and Latin Fathers,¹ and Augustine and Origen cite iv. 41 and 59 respectively from 'Esdras' without indicating that another than the canonical book is meant. Moreover, a Greek synopsis (Lag. 84) and a Syriac Catena (see on *E* ix. 55) treat *E* as 1 Esdras, and give the title 2 Esdras to \mathfrak{N}^2 . But Jerome meanwhile had condemned the two apocryphal books of Esdras with their 'dreams' (*Praef. Esd. et Neh.*), and his ruling was confirmed in due course by the Church. *E* is wanting in the early MSS. of the Vulgate, and it was rejected by the Council of Florence (1442). It is found in the Latin bibles of 1474, 1480, &c., but is regarded as apocryphal by De Lyra (1498), Karlstadt (1520), and Stephanus (1528). It is wanting in the Complutensian Polyglot (1514-17), and Luther ignored it—though not perhaps primarily (Bayer, 6 seq.)—for its triviality. There was even a belief that it did not exist in Greek (Torrey, 13 n. 1). The Council of Trent rejected it in 1546, but it is printed in an appendix in small type in the Tridentine edition of the Vulgate. Although it appears as 1 Esdras in the 1587 edition of the Septuagint (Rome), it was omitted three years later from the Sixtine Vulgate (Rome, 1590). In spite of the occasional attention paid to it by a few scholars, *E* has since too often been overlooked and neglected, and has only recently come into deserved prominence through the persistence of Sir Henry H. Howorth from 1893 onwards (see further Torrey, 13 seqq.).

E, on closer inspection, proves to be no free or less careful treatment of the Greek translation of the canonical books, as had been held by Keil, Zoëckler, Bissell, König (*Einführung*, § 97), and formerly Schürer (contrast his *Gesch. Volk. Isr.*, 3rd ed., iii. 328). There is an overwhelming body of opinion that it is translated from a Semitic (Hebrew and Aramaic) original. There are, it is true, various readings, identical or apparently connected with the literal Greek translation, but they do not outweigh the many considerable and characteristic differences of rendering, the variations in the transliteration or translation of proper names, and the numerous readings in *E* which can be explained only from the MT (see especially Bayer, 156 seqq.). That *E* is an independent version older than the \mathfrak{S} of the canonical books was suggested by Grotius (1644, see *P.S.B.*, xxv. 139), Whiston (1722), Pohlmann (1859), Ewald (1864), Lagarde (1874), and others, and has since been more cogently shown by Howorth and Torrey. It is pointed out that the \mathfrak{S} of E-N presents features characteristic of Theodotion's translation (viz. transliteration of gentiles, and of difficult or uncertain words) and parallel to his translation of Daniel. The \mathfrak{S} of *E*, on the other hand, as Gwynn also noticed, finds parallels in the 'Septuagint' text of Daniel, especially the first six chapters. Moreover, the \mathfrak{S} of *E* claims to be made from the Septuagint, and it is very probable that *E* took the place of the \mathfrak{S} of E-N in Origen's Hexapla. Volz, however, has properly drawn attention to the varying quality of the different sections of *E*, a feature which 'excludes the supposition that the Greek version can have been produced *ans eiuem Guss*'. In general, all the evidence tends to show that *E* held a more authoritative position than has been usually conceded to it (in consequence of Jerome), but that its unevenness as a translation and the complexity of its contents make its true origin and structure a more intricate problem.²

§ 3. TEXT VERSIONS, DATE, ETC.

(a) *Character of Translation.* *E*, on account of its peculiar relationship to the O.T., cannot be studied textually apart from the versions based directly upon the MT (see more fully, Torrey 62-114). While the \mathfrak{S} of E-N is un-Greek, literal and mechanical, *E* is the very reverse of servile, and its language both elegant and idiomatic. The vocabulary is extensive, containing several words that occur nowhere else in 'Septuagint' Greek, or only in other books of the Apocrypha, notably 2 Macc. (see Moulton's list, *ZATW*, xix. 232 seqq.). Semitic idioms are usually happily replaced by natural Grecisms. There is often a free treatment of the article, pronouns, and conjunctions; hypotaxis for the parataxis of MT; active verbs for passive. Condensation, paraphrase, and re-arrangement are frequent, and the translator has generally made the best of the original text, gliding over or concealing the difficulties. Sometimes he has misunderstood the original; but the rendering is carefully worded and thus presents an apparently plausible result (see e.g. i. 10-12, 38, 51). He

¹ e.g. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius; see Pohlmann, 263 seqq., and the tables in André, 22 seqq.

² Augustine, also, in a list of canonical books (*de doctr. Christ.* ii. 8) enumerates two books of Ezra 'of which our 1 Esd. was certainly one' (Volz). See, on the other hand, Bayer, 4.

³ See Howorth, *PSBA*, xxiii. 156 seqq., xxiv. 164 seqq., xxix. 31 seqq., xxxiii. 26 seqq.; Torrey, *ib.* xxv. 139 seqq., and his *Ezra Studies*, Chap. I; J. Gwynn, *Dist. Christ. Lit.*, 'Theodotion', and *Extracts from the Syro-Alex. Version of the LXX* (London, 1909), xx. seqq.

I ESDRAS

manifests his intelligence when the skilful paronomasia *ἀνεσσω καὶ ἀφεςσω* (iv. 62), suggestive of a Greek *composer*, goes back none the less to a Semitic original (cf. Susanna, 54 seqq.), and the use of the name Sisinnus (vi. 3) in place of the MT Tattenai is typical of his care. *E*, it is clear, was made to be read, it is a version rather than a translation, and its value for the criticism of the MT must not blind us to its imperfections (on which see Bayer, 11 seqq.). Consequently, a mean must be sought between a promiscuous and haphazard use of *E* and a whole-hearted though indiscriminate reliance upon its readings and paraphrases. The attempt must invariably be made to distinguish between the underlying text and the features which (as in the Septuagint elsewhere) are due to the translator alone, and the difficulty of this task in certain crucial cases is vital for the disentanglement of the problems of *E*.¹

(b) *E and the MT*. It is abundantly plain that *E* is not derived from the \mathfrak{C} (Theodotion) of the Canonical Books. Where there is agreement, the evidence points to accident or absence of intention, and is not strong enough to prove dependence (see the most recent study by Bayer, 156-61). In certain cases where they agree against the MT they sometimes are due to an easy misunderstanding, and sometimes point to a preferable reading; now and then the more literal version alone preserves an older text. It is highly significant that *E* is occasionally conflated, and presents simple doublets (e.g. ii. 25, vi. 29, ix. 8. 46), or more elaborate combinations made with some little care (e.g. v. 50, 58, 72 seq., vi. 5, 10, &c. [see Marq. 44-7]). This revision appears to have been made from the MT, and *E* vi. 25 actually presents the incorrect 'new' (חדש) of the MT by the side of the correct 'one' (אחד). Revision has also been made for the purpose of removing difficulties (so, probably v. 73b, in view of the date in vi. 1), or of making identifications (Zerubbabel, vi. 18, 27, 29). These adjustments, which are not found in Theodotion, seem to have been made first in the Greek version, and thus might appear to confirm the view that *E* is based upon an earlier Greek version (Ewald). The question of the underlying original, however, would still remain, and it is very important to notice that not only does *E* often presuppose a better text than the MT, but that some of the readings raise questions of literary structure and historical criticism. Consequently, *E* is not directly based either upon Theodotion's literal translation or the extant MT; the marks of revision point rather to an attempt to adjust to the MT an earlier version which differed from it in some material respects, large (nos. 1, 2, 4, on p. 1 above) and small (e.g. v. 39 seqq., 47, vi. 28, vii. 1, ix. 38, 49).²

(c) *MSS. and Versions*. The GREEK MSS. fall into two main classes, (1) Lucianic (MSS. 19, 108), and (2) B, A, &c. The former stand in a class by themselves, reveal many signs of correction and improvement in order to agree with the MT, and can be used only with great caution (see Torrey, 106 seqq.). The latter comprise two main subdivisions, B and A. B is distinctly the inferior, but shows fewer traces of correction. For a full grouping of all the MSS., see the elaborate discussion by Moulton, *ZATW*, xix. 211 seqq. N, it may be added, lacks *E*, but its subscription *Εσδρας β* (N xiii. 31) presupposes an 'Esdras A.'

Two old LATIN translations were printed by Sabatier (*Bibl. Sacr. Lat.* iii. 1041 seqq.), with a collation of MS. Sangermanensis— \mathfrak{L}^c (Cod. Colbertinus; no. 3703), and a later which in a revised form was used as the Vulgate. A summary from a Lucca MS. was edited by Lagarde, *Sept. Stud.* ii. 16 seqq. (\mathfrak{L} Lag.). These differ from, and, on the whole, are purer than \mathfrak{C}^b .

The SYRIAC Peshitta is without Chron., Ezra, and Neh. *E* \mathfrak{S} is the Syro-Hexapla of Paul of Tella, printed in Walton's Polyglot and by Lagarde (*Lib. Vet. Test. Apocr. Syr.*, 1861). It is explicitly said to be from the Septuagint, and the same is stated at the head of a collection of excerpts in the old Syriac Catena, British Museum, Add. 12168 (see on ix. 55). The variants of the latter and its selections from N are printed by Torrey, 5 seqq., and these selections, with a retranslation into Greek, collation, and complete introductory discussion by Gwynn (see p. 3 n. 3). \mathfrak{S} has many points of contact with \mathfrak{C}^b , especially in i. 1-9, but on the whole a relationship with \mathfrak{C}^b is more distinct.

The ETHIOPIAN translation (ed. Dillmann, *Vet. Test. Aeth.*, Vol. V) represents the text of \mathfrak{C}^b , \mathfrak{S} , &c., in contrast to \mathfrak{C}^a , and, according to Torrey (101), 'is a valuable witness to the Hexaplar text. It must have been made with unusual care from a comparatively trustworthy codex.'

The Arabic translation awaits study (*PSBA*, xxiv. 169); the Armenian is valueless (Volz, § 2).

(d) *Josephus*. The Jewish historian (first cent. A.D.), with his continuous history of the monarchy and post-exilic age, stands nearest (of extant compilations) to the chronicler in point of antiquity. He is a valuable exponent of the attempt to weave heterogeneous material into a readable and more or less consistent whole, and his greatest claim to attention lies in the evidence he

¹ On the general features of *E*'s version, see further Moulton, 226; Thackeray, 760a; Torrey, 83 seqq.

² For the textual value of *E* see, in addition to the commentaries on E-N, the discussions by Riessler (*Biblische Zeitschrift*, v. 146 seqq.) and Bayer.

INTRODUCTION

furnishes for a comparative study of the traditions encircling the names and events of the period from Josiah to the Samaritan schism. Jos. is the earliest witness to *E*: the relationship is unmistakable as regards material and even language (Eichhorn, *Einleit. Apokr.* [1795], 347 seqq.; Treuenfels, *Der Orient* [1850-1]; H. Bloch, *Quellen d. Fl. Jos.* [1879], 69 seqq.). There are several points of agreement with \mathfrak{S}^A as against \mathfrak{S}^B (Thackeray, 762*b*), and also with \mathfrak{S}^C ; Torrey (103) assigns the text an intermediate position. Unfortunately, Jos. is often extremely paraphrastic, and is therefore no safe guide for restoring the original of *E*. None the less, it is noteworthy that he is without the faults of *E* i. 29, 34 seq., he presupposes a text more complete and older than that in vi. 18, viii. 55, he uses a slightly different version of iii. (see Büchler, 64, 100), and, while obviously harmonizing in some places, elsewhere presents singular divergences or additions which do not appear to be arbitrary. In particular, his treatment of the stories of *E* and *N* is highly suggestive (see appendix to note on ix. 55). Besides utilizing the canonical sources (Jer., Dan., Est.), he has had access (as in Est.) to other Jewish traditions (see on vii. 15), and possessed some acquaintance with external history (see p. 11, and on i. 25). But although Jos. is not a direct witness to *E*'s text—and G. Holscher has suggested that he made use of Alexander Polyhistor (*Quellen d. Jos.* [1904], 36, 43 seqq., 51)—he testifies to the authority of *E*'s history, and it is unnecessary to assume (Swete, Thackeray, Bayer, 140) that he used it simply because it was written in good Greek.

(v) *Date and place.* While Jos. is evidence for the earlier existence of *E*, it is not certain that it then had precisely its present form. As a translation the linguistic features suggest that it belongs to the time of the old Greek translation of Daniel, and was perhaps due to the same translator (Torrey, 84 seq.). The date of the original is bound up with that of Chron.-Ez.-Neh., and must be some time after 333 B.C. The Persian period was past, and its history had become obscure, the identity of Darius and Apame (iv. 29) was forgotten, and the points of contact with Dan. and Est. (not necessarily in their present form), would suggest the late Greek age. The problem also involves the question whether iii. 1-v. 6 is a secondary insertion or part of the original compilation, and this naturally affects the discussion of the home of the book (see pp. 29, 32). Although the section seems to some scholars to point to the influence of Alexandrian thought and philosophy (Lupton, André, Thackeray, Volz), to others it is Palestinian (Zunz), or not necessarily Alexandrian (Torrey). The identification of Apame speaks for Egypt or Antioch; the knowledge of the topography of Jerusalem (v. 47, ix. 38) is not that of the compiler or translator but of his source, and therefore cannot be claimed to support a Palestinian home. Egypt is suggested by the free irony in iii., iv., the unveiled women (iv. 18), the references to navigation (iv. 15, 23), and piracy (v. 27), and elsewhere by the use of Coelestria (see ii. 17). Thackeray (762*a*) compares the 'friends' of the king (viii. 26; $\mathfrak{E} \mathfrak{S}$ $\sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$) with the 'first friends' who were third in scale of the courtiers at Alexandria, and with $\alpha\upsilon\ \phi\alpha\iota\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \sigma\omicron\iota$ (ii. 21, not in *E*) the phrase $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\ \phi\alpha\iota\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ in Aristes and frequently in Egyptian papyri. In so far as these data point to Egypt one may recall the interest in history-writing among the Hellenists Demetrius, Eupolemos, Artapanos, Alexander Polyhistor and others.

(f) *English versions.* It may be added that the old Geneva Bible, according to Lupton (6), is 'in some respects closer to the Greek than that of 1611'. Various improvements to the A.V. are suggested by Ball in the *Variorum Apocrypha*, and even the R.V. is not such an advance as might have been anticipated. Note, for example, the archaic 'Artaxerxes his letters' (ii. 30), 'cousin' (iii. 7), 'Jewry' (v. 7), and the gliding over of the obscurities of an imperfect \mathfrak{S} in viii. 8, and especially in the concluding words, ix. 55.

§ 4. PROBLEMS OF LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

I. *The Period.*

The problems of *E* and its relation to *E-N* involve that more complete and continuous series Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah which is united by sequence of contents and the recurrence throughout of similar features of language, interest, standpoint, and compilation. The 'chronicler's history'¹ of the post-exilic period deals with the fall of Jerusalem (586 B.C.), the return from exile under Zerubbabel and Jeshua, the reorganization of the Jewish people, the restoration of the Temple and

¹ By 'chronicler' is meant the hand which, by writing, compiling, or revising, brought the three consecutive books into practically their present form. Owing to the complexity of the compilation the term may not be an adequate one, but there seems no reason to doubt that there has been a single editorial process at some stage in the literary growth (the objections of Jampel, i. 108, 112, 115 seqq., and Davies, 16 are unnecessary). In any case, historical criticism cannot start from the untrustworthiness of Chronicles, and minimize the extent of the 'chronicler' in *E-N* (Davies, 16 seq., or exaggerate it (Torrey, 145 seqq., on the *E*-story), or assume that all other records are necessarily relatively superior (so apparently Meyer, *Entstehung*). See below, pp. 17-19.

I ESDRAS

the furtherance of religious conditions, the separation from the Samaritans and other non-Israelite neighbours, and the inauguration of a church under the Mosaic Law. It is the period during which a considerable portion of the O.T., after passing through the hands of Judaeans writers and editors, was reaching its present form, and the sole consecutive canonical source for this period, the chronicler's work, cannot be dated before the Greek age (333 B.C.). This source ignores all events between 586 and the decree of Cyrus, and omits other details which also refer to the period (see e.g. 2 Kings xxv. 22-30, Jer. xl.-xliv., lii. 28-34, Daniel, Esther). This feature, like the failure to record the history of (north) Israel after the fall of Samaria, cannot be wholly unintentional. Interest is concentrated upon exiles and reformers from Babylon, and upon their labours in rebuilding the Temple and in purifying religious and social conditions in the face of opposition within and without. A new and reformed Jewish community with its new Temple is linked historically with the old Judah of the Monarchy and the Temple of Solomon. The climax is reached partly in the great Covenant inaugurated by Ezra (N x.), after the Introduction of the Law (444 B.C.), and partly in the Samaritan schism initiated by Nehemiah (N xiii.). But such are the gaps and the one-sided standpoints that the records cannot be said to give us objective history. We have, rather, specific representations of certain events of vast importance for post-exilic Judaism, and, just as the account of the settlement of the old Israelite tribes in the land of their ancestors is found to contain conflicting traditions and the gravest difficulties, so also here, the compilation as a whole is dominated by certain larger views which tend to obscure the contradictions and intricacies that arise in any critical study of the data. In both cases the method of criticism is similar, and unfortunately the evidence is frequently insufficient for any confident recovery of the actual events during that period which is of such profound importance for the study of the O.T.¹

II. *The Age of Cyrus and Darius.*

(a) *Paucity of trustworthy evidence.* It is evident that the fall of Jerusalem could not have had the catastrophic effects that the traditional view assumes. We cannot picture Judah between 586 and 537 as half-empty.² Neither the number of deported Judaeans nor that of those who returned points to any depopulation, and even the events under Gedaliah's governorship and the account of the flight of the survivors into Egypt indicate that the disasters ending in 586, when taken by themselves, had no ruinous consequences for the land. Subsequent history is ignored in Chron., but it is known that Jehoiachin in later years received some favour, and that Tyre had once more a king. The thread is resumed in E i.-vi. (E ii.-vii.), in the reigns of Cyrus and Darius, but the narratives contain serious difficulties and conflicting representations (§ 6, a) which are increased by the independent prophecies of Haggai and Zech. i.-viii. (see on E ii. 1 seqq.). Not until we reach the time of Artaxerxes are the sources more extensive, and the light they throw upon preceding years renders the value of E i.-vi. extremely doubtful. That is to say, between 586 and 458 (E's return), or rather 444 (N's first visit to Jerusalem), there is a lengthy period of the greatest significance for the internal history leading up to Judaism and Samaritanism, and the only continuous source is both scanty and untrustworthy (see Marq., 67, Torrey, 156, and, partly, Meyer, 74).

(b) *The evidence of the prophets.* The prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, dated in the second year of Darius, 520, mention neither any previous important return nor any earlier attempt to rebuild the Temple. Zerubbabel now resumes dynastic history (Hag. ii. 23, contrast Jehoiachin, Jer. xxii. 24), and the high-priest Jeshua (grandson of Seraiah, 2 Kings xxv. 18-21), whose return in Dan. ix. 24-26 dates an epoch, is now officially installed. Yahweh had been angry seventy years (Zech. i. 12, cf. Jer. xxix. 10 seq., Dan. ix. 2); but is aroused and returns to Jerusalem (i. 16, ii. 10-13; contrast his departure in Ezek. x. 18 seq., xi. 23). He is jealous for Zion and full of wrath against her enemies; they shall be punished and his people shall enjoy increased happiness (i. 15, ii. 9). City and temple shall be rebuilt and the land re-inhabited (i. 16 seq., ii. 4, cf. vii. 7). The dispersed shall be rescued and again dwell in Jerusalem. The community in Babylon is hidden to escape to Zion (ii. 7, cf. Jer. li. 45). Babylon is threatened (vi. 1-8), and a passage which suggests that small bands of exiles might occasionally return heralds the forthcoming building of the temple (vi. 9-15). Haggai declares that the Temple is waste (i. 4, 9, *hārēb*, cf. the term in N ii. 3, 17) and he stirs the people to the work of rebuilding. The appeal is to the 'remnant' (i. 12, 14, ii. 2, cf. Zech. viii. 6), that is, not the

¹ Modern criticism is influenced by the radical conclusions of W. H. Kusters and the forcible defence by E. Meyer (*Entstehung*), whose own position, however, is in many respects opposed to the purely traditional; see S. R. Driver, *Lit.* 552 (and on the introductory literary questions, ib. 544 seqq.). A striking advance has recently been made by Torrey (*Ezra Studies*), to whose work the present writer gratefully records his indebtedness, and since reasons are given in these pages for adopting certain radical conclusions of Kusters, Torrey, and others, it may be well to refer readers to the writings (see § 8) of Davies, Driver, Holzhey, Jampel, Nikel, Ryle, and G. A. Smith, for the arguments adduced in support of a generally consistent traditional position.

² See Wellhausen, *OGN*, 1895, p. 185 seq.; Kusters, *Th. T.* xxix. 560; G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, ii. 268; Torrey, 290 seq., 297 seqq.; Kennett, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, 1905, pp. 172 seqq.

INTRODUCTION

40,000 of E. ii., but those who had escaped deportation (cf. Zeph. ii. 7, 9; Jer. xlii. 2, 15, &c., see Jahn, p. xxxviii.). Zerubbabel is the one to rebuild and complete the undertaking (Zech. iv. 8-10, vi. 12 seqq.). The people fetch wood and the work is begun on the twenty-fourth of the sixth month (Hag. i. 14 seq.); as yet one stone had not been set upon another (ii. 15). The foundations are laid on the twenty-fourth of the ninth month (ii. 10-19), and two years later, in 518, Zech. viii. 9 seqq. look back upon the happier period which had thus been inaugurated. But the exilic fasts were still being celebrated (vii. 3-5), the return of the dispersed was still an event to be anticipated. From these data it is reasonable to infer—with an influential number of scholars—that 'no considerable band of exiles can have returned—none that was able materially to influence the Jewish community' (Cheyne, *Ency. Bib.*, 1481 n. 4).

(c) *Objections.* Various counter-arguments, influenced by the chronicler's history in E-N, have been brought forward (see p. 6 n. 1). Those based upon a representation of events which has perplexed a generation of scholars naturally tend to beg the question. For example, it is urged that the prophets address returned exiles and it was unnecessary to describe the people as such; that they do not say that the builders were not returned exiles; that only E i.-iii. explain the events of 520-516 and subsequent history; that the Temple could not have been built by the native 'heathen' Judaeans; that the main stream of Jewish life had been diverted to Babylon and only the presence of a Babylonian 'leaven' explains the prophecies of Hag. and Zech. While some scholars recognize and seek to explain the silence of the prophets touching a return and rebuilding before 520, others contend that there are indeed references to these events. Some, observing the profound difference between the promises of the 'Deutero-Isaiah' (xl.-lv.) and the history in E iii. seqq., are of opinion that, since 'the reality was a bitter disenchantment, the disillusionment so great, the prophets naturally do not refer to the events. But others argue that unless these promises had been essentially fulfilled there would have been so fatal a falsification of popular expectation that the oracles of Is. xl. seqq. would scarcely have survived. It is obvious that the preservation of prophecies is hardly conditioned by their fulfilment, however partial, and the difference between the anticipations and the reality was surely sufficient, on the most conservative view, to throw Is. xl. seqq. into oblivion. Haggai, it is objected, ignores a future return and may well have ignored previous events—but his contemporary Zech. excludes a previous return, testifies to the continuation of the exile, and looks forward to a return. The *argumentum e silentio* is undoubtedly valid. Zech. (i. 2-6), in appealing to the people to repent, alludes to past experience, but does not refer to the return—which would have been the most immediate proof of the might of Yahweh. Was there a wish to put courage into the poor hearts of the returned exiles? There was one practical illustration of divine grace, but there is no allusion to it. In fact, the urgent supplication to Yahweh (i. 12) is unintelligible had a new era dawned as in E i.-iii.: one may note Daniel's prayer for divine intervention (Dan. ix., cf. also N i.) and the prayers of E after his return (E ix. 8, N ix. 30 seq.). In point of fact, Zech. sees the punishment and misery of the past (vii.), and the 'decadence of promises' belong to the future (viii.). Did the prophets intentionally refrain from mentioning the material help the exiles had received in the time of Cyrus, in order to emphasize the necessity of relying upon spiritual help? The very passage which has been quoted in support of this view refers to the small beginnings recently inaugurated by Zerubbabel (iv. 6, 9 seqq.) and ignores E i.-iv.

There is no explanation of the gap between 537 and 520; there is no hint of any hindrance, cessation, or of any more or less continuous rebuilding (see § 6 a): the people are negligent and remiss, and according to Haggai the distress caused by the failure of the rains was a punishment for not rebuilding the Temple (i., cf. 2 Sam. xxi. 1-10, Zech. xiv. 17). It hardly required a Babylonian exile to teach this. Haggai certainly refers to an altar (ii. 14, 'there'), but this does not prove the accuracy of E iii. 3 or its context. A holy place is not necessarily deserted when the sanctuary is ruined, and Jer. xli. 5 already presupposes an altar; to contend that the existence of this altar throughout the exile ought to have been mentioned in the O.T. is unreasonable. Indeed, the references to priests and sacrifices (Hag. ii. 10-14, cf. Zech. vii. 3 seqq.) go further and suggest that the cult of Yahweh was independent even of the existence of a Temple (cf. Sellin, *Stud.* 53 seq.; Torrey, 305). There is, moreover, no good reason for believing that native Judaeans would be 'heathenish', and that if they had rebuilt the Temple they would have been treated otherwise by the reformers E and N. If Jer. and Ezek. bear witness to low religious conditions, Hag., Mal., and Is. lvi.-lxvi. indicate no great improvement after the return; and the degenerate community which all scholars recognize in the latter sources and which needed the reforms of E and N include—on the traditional view—the Babylonian 'leaven.' Yet the Judaeans and Samaritans felt themselves to be heirs of Israel and the latter could claim to worship Yahweh (2 Kings xvii. 32 seq., 41, Jer. xli. 5, Ezek. xxxiii. 24, E iv. 2). The fall of Jerusalem and the Exile do not exclude the presence—even among 'the poorest of the land'—of men who might follow in the footsteps of the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.), or of such seers as Amos, Hosea, Micah or Jeremiah; and considering the piety of the Jews in distant Elephantine (Sachau-papyri), there is clearly no necessity to deny the possibility of the continuous worship of Yahweh during the exile, or to demand after 538 the presence of a 'leaven' which nevertheless did not preclude the abuses confronting E, N, Mal., and the writers in Is. lvi. seqq. It is obviously impossible to start with presuppositions of what was orthodox Yahwism and what was heathenism whether in Elephantine or in Palestine (before or after 536). If, too, Meyer's argument (177) is valid, that the Levitical family of Henadad (E iii. 9, wanting in E ii.) was indigenous, indigenous also was the family of Iddo to which Zech. belonged (see E v. 1); and this scholar's recognition of the prominence in and around Jerusalem of Calebite and other families who had never tasted exile (see § 5 c) is extremely important for any estimate of the internal conditions. The evidence of Hag. and Zech. outweighs other evidence which might appear to

I ESDRAS

be contrary; hence one can hardly assume that the deliverance of Jeshua (Zech. iii. 2) necessarily refers to his return seventeen years previously, or that the name Zerubbabel suggests that other Jews with him were necessarily 'begotten in Babylon'. Nor can decisive objections be based upon references in E vii.-x., N i. seqq. to an earlier return. That men (? exiles) should come and assist in the rebuilding of the Temple is a promise for the future in Zech. vi. 15. The references in E ix. 4, x. 6 seq. present their own peculiar difficulties on any view, and in all probability the story of E should come after N i.-vi. (see III. a). N i. 2 seq. are inconclusive: they may be used to support a theory (Kosters, 45; Berth., 47; Torrey, 301 n. 27; Davies, 161), although Ryle (149), who maintains an independent, though strictly conservative position, refers the passage to the people who had escaped the exile—the passage, in any case, must be considered in the light of evidence for some disaster between the age of Zerubbabel and the return of N (see further, § 5 f). It is to be remembered, also, that the belief in a great return under Cyrus (or Darius) might influence the description of subsequent events even as the complete Mosaic legislation appears at first sight to be confirmed by the form which the revised and redacted history has taken in the books that follow the Pentateuch.

(a) *Summary.* The account of a large return to rebuild the Temple, whether in the time of Cyrus or Darius, must be tested by the independent Hag. and Zech. Great weight is often laid upon the circumstantial list in E ii., and its genuineness has been upheld, particularly by Meyer (73, 98 seqq., 191 seqq.; note the criticisms of Kosters, *Th. T. xxvi.* 530-41; see below, p. 35. He, however, rejects in the main the rest of the Cyrus-history (49, 73, 99, 191, 193; Driver, *Lit.*, 552), although the decree of Cyrus is in itself entirely plausible (Nikel, 31-7; Torrey, 144 n. 12), and the list is closely bound up with the whole series E i.-vi. His position appears inconsistent from any traditional standpoint (see Nikel, 42 seq., Davies, 14, 80 seq.), as well as from one more consistently critical, although his recognition that the list (which contains names recurring throughout E-N) is fundamental for the criticism of the post-exilic history is thoroughly sound. But the list stands or falls with its context, and when it is admitted that the success of the opposition in E iv. proves that the return has been exaggerated (see Sellin, *Stud.* 1; O. C. Whitehouse, *Isaiah*, ii. 228; G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, ii. 298 seq.), or that the list has been re-edited (Holzhey, 15; Davies, 51), it is necessary to determine what details in E i.-vi. may be regarded as even essentially accurate. The tolerance and kindness of Amil-Marduk (to Jehoiachin), Nabunaid (who sent back Merbaal to be king of Tyre), Cyrus, Cambyses, and Darius¹ certainly allow the probability of the return of bands of exiles, even as the Sachau-papyri show how Cambyses might favour native Jewish communities. But E i.-vi. are so closely interconnected as a piece of history that if we accept—as we must—the testimony of Hag. and Zech., it is difficult, if not impossible, to reconstruct from E the course of events. On the one hand, we gain new presuppositions regarding the internal conditions of the age. On the other, there is remarkable confusion in the traditions of Cyrus and Darius in E and E, E ii. is repeated in the history of the time of Artaxerxes, and a narrative of this later period is actually inserted in E i.-vi.; these combine with other features to extend the problems of E i.-vi. to those connected with the work of E and N.

III. The Work of Ezra and Nehemiah.

(a) *Ezra.* In the story of E there is considerable intricacy in the description of the separation from the heathen on the part of the 'children of the captivity' (i. e. E's small band of exiles, or the congregation presumably formed in 536-516), and the inauguration of the new community, consisting of these and the elect of the 'seed of Israel'. The whole story is closely interconnected, and much difficulty is caused by N i.-vii. which sever E vii.-x. from N viii. seqq. by twelve years. There is, moreover, a very strong presumption that the Reading of the Law was originally described shortly after E's arrival (cf. E ix.), and not (as in N viii.) after this lengthy interval, during which we hear nothing of him. Finally, on independent grounds there seems to be no place for E before the first visit, at all events, of N. It is indeed allowed that 'it is impossible to decide upon the evidence at our disposal' (G. A. Smith, *Expositor*, July, 1906, p. 16), or that this later position of E is only a possibility (Wellhausen); but it seems very doubtful whether the story is trustworthy (H. P. Smith, Torrey, Jahn), and even if it be historical, many agree that it cannot be placed before N i.-vi. (Berth., Buhl, Cheyne, Guthe, Hoonaeker [esp. *Rev. Bibl.*, x. 15 seqq.], Kennett, Kent, Kosters, Marq., Sellin, Wildeboer). See further the notes on E viii.-x.

(b) *Nehemiah.* N was governor from the 20th year of Artaxerxes (Jos. xi. 5 7, 25th of Xerxes) to the 32nd (N v. 14), i. e. 444-432, and we hear of a return to the king and a second visit (xiii. 4-6). But N xiii. is joined to xii. so closely as to imply that only on the occasion of the later visit were the walls dedicated, although the ceremony is ostensibly the immediate sequel of their completion, two months after his first visit (vi.).² This must be due to defective compilation (cf. Nikel, 196 n. 1).

¹ For the external evidence see Berth., 26 seq.; Jampel, i. 502 seqq., ii. 11 seqq.

² Rawlinson and Klostermann (so Davies, 267), Howorth (*PSBA*, xxv. 18 seq.), G. A. Smith (*op. cit.* 10-12), R. H. Kennett (*Camb. Bibl. Essays*, 120); the dates N vi. 15, vii. 73, ix. 1 were evidently meant—by the compiler—to be consecutive. That the walls were actually completed in 52 days may be 'hardly credible' (Ew. 157 n. 5); Jos. (§ 179) allows 2 years and 4 months (hardly an invention, Ew.), and dates the completion in the ninth month (cf. 2 Macc. i. 18) of the 28th year of Xerxes.

INTRODUCTION

which will also explain the description of N's social reforms (v.) amid the intrigues during the hurried rebuilding of the walls, where N looks back upon the period of his governorship (v. 14). In fact, his strong position as reformer in v. seems more in harmony with that in xiii. than with the picture of suspicion and hostility represented in iv., vi., and this serious difficulty touching the course of N's work (vii. 2 may hint at his departure) hampers every attempt to trace the history of his period. Consequently N, even with the elimination of the E-story, cannot be in its original form, as is clear also from the literary features of xi. and xii. (see also Torrey, 225 seq., 248 seq.).

(c) *The List N vii.* N's proposal to summon the people in order to augment Jerusalem (vii. 4 seqq.) is severed by part of the E-story (N viii.-x.) from the list of inhabitants (xi.), other lists (xii. 1-26), the dedication of the walls and arrangements for the Temple officials (xii. 27-47), &c. His story is no longer autobiographical (contrast, however, xiii. 4-31) and fresh sources are to be recognized. Since the list found by him (vii. 5) is that of the return of Zerubbabel (E ii.), it is often assumed that the sequel in xi. must also refer to this earlier period (Ewald, Smend, Stade, Meyer, &c.). But xi. differs so widely from vii. 6 seqq. that both cannot be authentic (Meyer, 189). It is more probable, however, that xi. belongs to the story of N and follows upon vii. 4, 'though the narrative is hardly continued *uno tenore*' (Driver, 551). Yet, on any theory, the presence of N vii. 6-73 is inexplicable, since it is difficult to see why even a compiler should quote an *ancient* list which excluded the more recent return of E (E viii. 1-14; cf. Holzhey, 37). If 'a genealogical register was necessary' (Davies), this would have been out-of-date, and although lapse of time and later adjustment might explain—on this view—the various differences between E ii. and N vii., there are far more significant differences in N x. 1-27, a list which is referred to N's time. Now, its conclusion (N vii. 73 b) is the proper introduction to the Reading of the Law (viii.), which is in a more natural position between E viii. and ix., and Torrey (256 seqq., cf. Kent, 369) points out that N vii. 70-3 a, also, are more in harmony after the account of E's return. Indeed, vii. 66-9 (the enumeration) and 61-5 (the expulsion of the impure in Zerubbabel's time, see on E v. 38) would be useless for N's purpose, and in fact H. P. Smith would place the entire list (from vii. 5) after E viii. 36 (393 n. 1; see, however, Torrey 259 n. 9). Accordingly, through compilation and revision the account of N's work, with its own chronological embarrassments, has been broken by a portion of the story of E, the first part of which is now found before N i., while the list in vii. (vii. 5 a, 73 suggest a gathering of the people) records details which are not in keeping with the context, whereas in E ii. it is in a consistent context, albeit an unhistorical one. While the Reading of the Law (vii. 73 b-viii.) abruptly introduces E, the preceding material is partly (at least) connected with E's return in E vii. seqq., and partly belongs to the (unhistorical) account of Zerubbabel's return. A considerable portion of the E-story is sundered from N viii. seqq., but the description of the separation from the heathen is confused and closely interrelated, and the list of those who had married strange women (see on E ix. 21-36) includes families who are not mentioned in E's band (E viii. 1-14), but appear in the list of E ii., which in N vii. is connected with the return of E! Finally, this great list, though used for the time of Cyrus (or Darius, E v.) and treated in N vii. as a document of that period, reveals traces of the age of N himself, and of having been adjusted to the earlier context (see on E v. 24 seqq., 40, 44 seqq., 46 seqq.). Hence it would seem that E ii. N vii. originally belonged to an account of a return in some record of the history of the times of N, E, and Artaxerxes. On its repetition, see p. 19 (§ 6).

(d) *The Ezra-story.* The well-supported view that E came to Jerusalem after N i.-vi. implies some rearrangement of the material; and the suitability of N vii. (some portion) and viii. between E vii. seqq. and ix. suggests, not that the *latter* part of the E-story has been removed from E x. and placed after N vi., but that the whole once stood after that chapter. The complexity of the list vii. (which overlaps with E viii.) still remains, and it is at this point in the book that the critical problems become most intricate. But it must be noticed that the E-story is certainly composite and not in its original form, and some of the confusion may have arisen when it was divided and part of it placed before N i.¹ If, moreover, the E-story stood after N vi. it may be observed that there is a certain relationship between the stories of E and N: the reference to the son of Eliashib, E x. 6, cf. N xiii. 4, 28; the suitability of N xiii. 1-2, between E x. 9 and 10 (W. R. Smith; Berth., 89); the coincidence in the day of arrival of each (see E viii. 6); the twelve-years' gap in the history of each, and the parallel features in their measures on behalf of temple, priests and people. E, however, is mentioned only incidentally in the story of N (xii. 36, doubtful, see the comm.), and it is impossible that the two laboured together. On the other hand, the Tirshatha is prominent at the Reading of the Law (N viii. 9) and the signing of the Covenant (x. 1), and also in the list, vii. (v. 65, the degradation of the priests; v. 70, gifts to the treasury); he is identified with N (see on E ix. 49), and N is

¹ For the interrelation between the now sundered portions see p. 47, and cf. JE in Ex. xxxiii. seqq. and Num. x. 29-36, xi.; and also the contents of 2 Sam. v.-viii., xxi.-xxiv.

I ESDRAS

equally prominent in his own story (especially v., xiii.). N was not the only governor in post-exilic Jerusalem (N v. 15, Mal. i. 8) but it is noteworthy that the E-story, especially in the narrative-ports, shows no interest in either the governor or the high-priest; the story seems to be written from an independent standpoint, and is focussed upon the austere figure of E alone. The story represents a period of divine favour and royal clemency after the sufferings of Israel (Dan. ix., N i. presupposes an earlier situation); it obviously comes after the disappearance of Zerubbabel, but it cannot be placed before the introduction of N. There are independent arguments for the tradition of a return under N and religious reorganization (see § 5 *b, d*), and this appears to be supplemented by the account of E. The latter describes the return of E and a representative community to a temple, but one sorely in need of replenishing (E vii. 15-27, viii. 36); to an ecclesiastical body (note E viii. 17), but a negligent one (N x. 32 seqq.); to a community that worshipped Yahweh, but had fallen from the ideal. It can hardly be called an Autobiography (Meyer, 205) or a Memoir, and there is no evidence to prove it to be a mere invention or fiction. Rather is it based upon facts which link the energy of N with the subsequent appearance of an established orthodox Jewish Church. It may be regarded as an ideal description of the inauguration of Judaism, and the introduction of the 'Book of the Law of Moses' (the Pentateuch is probably meant) is a later parallel to the story of the (re-)discovery of the 'Book of the Law' (Deuteronomy) in the reign of Josiah; cf. also the chronicler's accounts of Asa, Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah (2 Chron. xiv. 4, xv. 3, 10-13, xvii. 7, 9, xxix. 10). It does not seem to have been written by the compiler of the series Chron.-E-N; it appears rather as a tradition of independent origin, written around the age of N, combined with the story of N and ultimately with the great post-exilic history of Jerusalem and the Temple.

IV. *Interrelation of Data.*

(a) *Intricacy of parallels.* The intricacy of the list E ii. N vii. for the history of Cyrus, Darius (E) and Artaxerxes does not stand alone. The close connexion in the narratives relating to Cyrus and Darius appears in E iii. 7 compared with E iv. 48, in iii. 1 with E v. 6, and in E iii. 2 with E v. 4-6. The Temple, according to Hag. and Zech., was not commenced before the time of Darius, in contrast to E iii.; but the laments in E iii. 12 in the time of Cyrus curiously recall Hag. ii. 3 seqq. The social and religious reorganization implied in E ii. 59, 62, vi. 21 finds a parallel in the reforms of E, and while E ii. 70, iii. 1, introduce the erection of the altar, the text in E v. 46 seq. presupposes a later period, and in fact these verses in N vii. 73, viii. 1, form the prelude to the Reading of the Law. The latter event is the sequel to the record of a return (N vii.) which in E ix. is that of E himself. E iii. is unhistorical, and has probably been influenced by material relating to the time of N; thus Meyer (73, 99) points to N viii. 17 seq., and Jahn compares iii. 10-13 with N xii. 40-3. The account of the opposition in E iv. is untrustworthy, and there is a marked resemblance between the details and N iv., vi., enhanced by the insertion in E iv. 7-24 of a record of the time of Artaxerxes. This record attests a return of some importance, which, however, has yet to be identified, and while the decrees of Cyrus and Darius agree (cf. also Artaxerxes and E) in presenting several very similar features (Torrey, 125 seqq., 158; Bayer, 117 seqq.), the historical basis for any decree on the lines they take cannot be found in their reigns. For parallels in the stories of E and N see above, p. 9 (*d*). Such is the interrelation of the contents that it is hardly surprising that later sources should not infrequently combine Zerubbabel and Ezra (Iag. 18; Torrey, 49 n. 17) and that both should be united with Jeshua in a return in the time of Darius (Iag. 84). Even N xii. 47 looks back and mentions together Zerubbabel and N (see Berth.); and if Hashabiah and Sherebiah in N xii. 24 may be identified with the names in E viii. 18 seq., Joiakim (son of Jeshua) and E appear to be correlated much in the same way that N xii. 12-26 seem to confuse the times of Joiakim, N and E (see also the view of Kesters, 91 seq.).

(b) *Some modern views.* The endeavour to recover the historical facts has led to very divergent conclusions among modern scholars. One favourite view has retained Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes in E iv., between Cyrus and Darius, by the simple device of changing the names or of assuming an alternative nomenclature. Equally popular has been the theory that Artaxerxes and Darius are to be identified with the second bearer of each name, and, indeed, this may have been the view of the compiler or writer (see Torrey, 38 seq., 178 seq.). Although this leaves an astonishing gap between Cyrus and Darius II, the belief that the Artaxerxes of the stories of N and E was the later king (404-359 B.C.) has found very weighty support (de Sauley, Maspero, Hoonacker, and Howorth [partly], Marq., H. P. Smith [382], &c., see further Berth., 30; and *PSBA*, xxiii. 319 seqq.). It has also been proposed to identify the Cyrus of the narratives with Darius and Darius with Art. I, and so close is the interconnexion of events that N viii. x. has been placed in the time of Zerubbabel, and the whole of E-N (extending from 537 to 432) has been compressed within a few years (see H. Winckler, *Helmholtz's World's Hist.* iii. 216 seq., and the summaries in Jampel, ii. 1 seq.). Others hold that Zer. first returned in the time of Darius, and that E iii. 8 seqq. properly belongs to that later period. Moreover, the historical and prophetic writings are necessarily co-ordinated, and thus Hag. and Zech. have appeared to some to be of or about the time of Cyrus, although if Darius be D. II they are brought down to (about) 423-404 (see Howorth, *PSBA*, xxiii. 324). So, also, the prophecies in Is. xl.-lxvi., are subdivided and connected with the history of the times of Cyrus and Artaxerxes, although, under the influence of

INTRODUCTION

another theory of the history, the chapters are once more treated as virtually a whole, either relatively early (c. 537-520; Sellin, *Stud.* 160; Rothstein) or relatively late (H. P. Smith, 371 n. 1, 379 n. 3; Torrey, 288 n. 8, 314; Kennett). In contrast to these efforts to overcome the difficulties are the views of those scholars who do not admit the intricacies but continue to maintain the essential trustworthiness of E-N, the unhistorical character of Chron. itself being, nevertheless, almost unanimously realized. In so far as this is based upon the manner in which the narratives appear to be mutually confirmatory—of the conservative attitude to the criticism of the Pentateuch—and superficially, at least, consistent, it is necessary to observe that the chronicler's history is singularly simple compared with the forms taken in *E*, or in *Jos.*, or in the traditions that prevailed elsewhere in ancient times.

(c) *Some ancient views.* *Jos.*, who is well-informed on the last Babylonian kings, asserts that the kingdom fell to Cyrus the Persian and Darius the Mede; the two were kinsmen and the latter, whose father was Astyages, had another name among the Greeks (x. II, 2, 4). Cyrus, son of Cambyses, was the father of the better-known Cambyses; his mother, according to tradition, was the sister of Cyaxares and daughter of Astyages. Astyages, the last Median king, was the son of Cyaxares and was defeated by Cyrus. But this name is also given by Alexander Polyhistor and others to Cyaxares (c. 624-584), the founder of the Median empire, who took part with Nabopolassar in the attack upon Assyria.¹ When the father of Darius is called Ahasuerus (*Dan.* ix. 1; cf. the synopsis, Lag. 15, where he is born of Vashû), and the latter and Nebuchadrezzar capture Nineveh (*Tobit* vi. 15), the names Ahasuerus and Cyaxares have evidently been confused (Rawlinson). The Ahasuerus of Esther was certainly placed soon after the deportation of Jehoiachin by Nebuchadrezzar (so ii. 5 seq.), but in *Judith* iv. 1-6 the last-mentioned reigns over the Medes at a time when the Jews had recently returned from captivity and the high-priest was one Joiakim. The historical foundation for Esther's king can only be Xerxes, although *Jos.*, LXX, and early writers identify him with Artaxerxes. *Jos.*, moreover, states that he was also called Cyrus—in *Dan.* v. 31, vi. 28, Darius the Mede becomes king after the fall of Babylonia and is followed by Cyrus—and gives the name Xerxes to the Artaxerxes of the stories of E and N. The difficulty of distinguishing the names would obviously be increased by the fact that Darius I was actually followed by Xerxes (485-465), and D. II (423-404) by Art. II (404-359), and that D. II had a son Cyrus, famous for the unsuccessful expedition against his elder brother Art. II. Not to pursue the confusing details further, it is enough to notice that the later historians had behind them a series of events of vital importance. During a relatively brief period the power of Assyria was broken up, Scythians and Medes entered into W. Asiatic politics, a new Babylonian empire was restored only to fall before the Persian régime under Cyrus: a little more than a century later another Cyrus created a turmoil in W. Asia (400), and finally the Greeks, who had been gradually coming into closer touch with the Oriental world, established a new age under Alexander the Great. How soon history became enwrapped in legend is obvious from Herodotus and Xenophon (fifth century B.C.) and from Ctesias, who is even said to have drawn upon Persian records. *Jos.*, for his part, endeavoured to reduce the confusion into some order; the Seder Olam (ch. xxx) ingeniously identifies all the Persian kings: Cyrus, Darius, Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes—*Dan.* xi. 2 knows only of four—and the whole of the Persian age from the restoration of the Temple to the time of Alexander the Greek was even compressed into a few decades. The appearance of simplicity in the chronicler's history of the period is misleading; see further § 6 c.

§ 5. DATA FOR RECONSTRUCTION.

The foregoing survey of the intricacies of E-N, the prevailing confusion in regard to the period, and the efforts made by ancient and modern writers to present the historical facts, will perhaps be convincing proof that the difficulties in E-N are genuine. They concern both E-N and *E*, and any attempt to discuss the origin and structure of *E* must form some preliminary conception of the underlying history. For this the story of N seems most fruitful.

(a) *The Samaritans.* N's age was one of intermarriage and close intercourse between the Jews, Samaritans, and other neighbours (vi. 18, xiii. 3, 4, 23, 24, 28). The elliptical repulse of the Samaritans in N ii. 20 implies that they, as in E iv. 2 seq., had some claim 'to a share in the fortunes of Jerusalem' (Ryle, 171), and that they 'would have had no quarrel with the Jews if they had been permitted to unite with the latter in their undertakings and privileges' (Davies, 177). These details, the character of the intermarriages, the efforts to compromise with N (vi. 2-4), the close relationship presupposed by the subsequent bitterness after the schism, the fact that Samaritanism was virtually a sister-sect of Judaism—these preclude the present position of E's return and marriage-reforms and make it extremely doubtful whether there had as yet been any serious Samaritan hostility. They also suggest that the records of E-N have been written and revised under the influence of a bitter anti-Samaritan feeling, the date of which can hardly be placed before N xiii. Indeed, it is not improbable that the Samaritan schism should be placed (with *Jos.* xi. 7 seq.) at the close of the Persian period (see further Marq., 37 seq.; Jahn, 173 seq.; Torrey, 321 seq., 331 seq.).

(b) *Place of Ez.* iv. 7-23. This undated record of the reign of Artaxerxes, in spite of some

¹ See *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., on these names.

I ESDRAS

internal difficulties (see criticisms in Berth., 18 seq., Nikel, 182), probably illustrates the story of N when 'Tobiah sent letters to put me in fear' (vi. 19).¹ It points to some new reconstruction of the city by returned exiles—evidently after an earlier disaster—and requires the assumption that the story of N is focussed upon the governor alone and that N and his military escort (ii. 9, cf. E v. 2, contrast ib. viii. 51 seq.) brought back a band of exiles (so Jos.); see below (d). Against this the objection has been brought that N, in spite of the royal command (E iv. 21 seq.), continued to build and actually did complete the walls. On the other hand, the walls were already practically finished (vi. 1, vii. 1, see Kyle, 219), and some time would necessarily elapse before letters could reach Artaxerxes and his reply come to hand (cf. the situation in E v. 5). The king does not order the walls to be destroyed or weakened; N naturally had other building operations to attend to in addition to the walls, and these may well have been stopped 'by force and power' (E iv. 23). The letter to Artaxerxes urges that the rebuilding of Jerusalem would be detrimental to the security of the province (iv. 13, 19 seq.) and disloyalty was the strongest charge brought against the governor (N ii. 19, vi. 6-7). In fact, N vii. 2 seq. may suggest that the perturbed governor left his brother in charge of the city while he visited the king—his leave had been limited (ii. 6)—and although the sequence of events is admittedly obscure there is a distinct gap between his position in N i.-iv., vi. and that as represented in xiii. (cf. v.). The formal steps of the Samaritans in E iv. 7 seq. (similarly the satrap in E v. seq.) stand in contrast to the confusing account of the hostility in N iv., vi. against one who had come armed with royal authority, and undue weight must not be laid upon the present form of the N-story (see above [a]). All in all, the evidence does not exclude the helpful conjecture that E iv. 7-23 illustrate the troubles of N at that stage where the continuation of the book (after vi. 19) is almost inextricably complex.

(c) *The semi-Edomite population.* In the list of those who helped to rebuild the wall (N iii.) it is noteworthy (1) that very few of the names can be at all plausibly identified with the families who apparently returned with either Zerubbabel or Ezra (Kosters, 47), and (2) that some of the names have Calebite affinities.² The list is evidence for the poverty of the Babylonian section of population and for the prominence of the Judaeans, who include both the natives and those Calebite and allied groups who moved up from the south of Judah some time after 586. The presence of the latter is only to be expected, and the fact, pointed out by Meyer himself in 1896, is obviously fundamental for the criticism of the book of Ezra (see Kosters, *Th. T.* xxxi. 536).³ In this Calebite or semi-Edomite Judah—and to call these groups 'half heathen' (with Nikel, 56, 64) is to beg the question—we may find a starting-point for our conception of the district from the time of their immigration northwards to the date of the far-reaching reorganization associated with the names of N and E. Further, the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem in N xi. recurs, though with variations, in 1 Chron. ix., where it represents the compiler's conception of the post-exilic population after the captivity. According to his perspective of history, there was an old Israel which included a Judah of Calebite and Jerahmeelite origin (1 Chron. ii. and iv.) and some later stage which corresponds closely with N xi. N xi., however, differs widely from the lists in E ii. and viii. and ignores the return of Zerubbabel and Ezra. Its disagreement is hardly a proof that these lists are authentic; what is significant is the agreement between the Judaean clans Perez, Shelah and the semi-Edomite Zerah in N xi. and the mixed genealogies in 1 Chron. ii. and iv. The chronicler, it will be observed, knows of no earlier Judah; his evidence in ii., iv. is (in his view) pre-Davidic, and it agrees with this that his lists of the Levitical orders of David's time illustrate the close bond uniting these ecclesiastical bodies with people of south Palestinian and Edomite affinity.⁴

(d) *A decree and a return.* The introduction to the Jerusalem list reads like the sequel to the account of some return (N xi. 3, 1 Chron. ix. 2; cf. E ii. 70, N vii. 73, and see Ewald, 159 n. 2). The list itself, after dealing with priests, Levites, &c., proceeds to refer to those who dwell in the country, and it is noteworthy that N xi. 23 seq. have in view the fulfilment of some royal decree touching the singers (cf. E iv. 54 seq., E vii. 24). The singers, also, are subsequently collected from the Netophathite and other villages which they had built at some unspecified period (xii. 28 seq.; cf. the Levites in 1 Chron. ix. 16), and the explicit references to the rest of Israel and their cities (xi. 20, 27), before the assembling at the dedication of the walls (xii. 27), recall the situation before

¹ H. P. Smith, 348; Kent, 358; see also the remarks of Sellin, *Ser.*, 53 seqq., *Stud.* 16-35. With Tobiah, cf. the Aram. form Tabeel, E iv. 7 (Hoonacker, *Rev. Bibl.* x. 183 n. 6; Sellin, *Stud.* 33).

² See for (2) Meyer, *Ent.*, 114-19, 147, 167, 177 seqq., 181, 183, and his *Israeliten*, 352 n. 5, 399, 402, 409, 429 n. 5, 430. See also on E v. 26.

³ Cf. also H. Guthe, *E. Bi.* 2249; T. K. Cheyne, *ib.* 3385; H. P. Smith, *Hist.* 354 n. 1; R. Kittel, *Chron.* 14, 16; Jahn, 99; Kennett, *Essays*, 117, 123; Torrey, 328, n. 53; E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen, *Chron.* 80, 98, 104.

⁴ See also E. Meyer and B. Luther, *Israel.*, 442 seqq., for evidence connecting Judah and the Edomites; in their opinion, however, the data found in literature relating to pre-monarchical times, refer to pre-Davidic conditions.

INTRODUCTION

the exiles were assembled in Jerusalem after their return and settlement in the Zerubbabel-story (E ii. 70, iii. 1). Thus, the difficult and much revised narratives of N's work, between vi. and xiii., are connected with the list of the return in vii., with the return of E (see p. 9 c), and with some return associated with the figure of N himself. G. A. Smith observes that the reforms of N 'are best explained through his reinforcement by just so large a number of Babylonian Jews under just such a leader as E' (*Ezras*, July, 1906, p. 7 seq.). On the other hand, there is insufficient historical evidence for the presence of E and his band, and the above details strongly suggest that there was an account of some other return in connexion with the activity of N, although it is still impossible to reconstruct the course of N's work (see § 4, III. b).

(e) *The Temple.* The history after the rise of the Davidic Zerubbabel is a blank which can be filled only by conjecture (see e.g. Ewald; Sellin, *Ser.*; Nikel, 142-6, and others). The situation in Jerusalem at the return of N cannot be explained by the disasters at the fall of Jerusalem about 140 years previously. The city was in great affliction and reproach, and N's grief, confession, and prayer recall E's behaviour at the tidings of the heathen marriages. The ruins of Jerusalem were extensive (N i. 3, ii. 3, 8, 13, iii., cf. *Ecclus.* xlix. 13), and it is disputed whether the *birah* (ii. 8) refers to the fortress on the north side of the Temple (G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, ii. 347 seq., 461), or the Temple itself (cf. 1 *Chron.* xxix. 1 and see Jahn, pp. iv, 93). According to 2 *Macc.* i. 18, N built both the Temple and the Altar, and Jos. (independently) asserts that he received permission to build the walls of the city and to finish the Temple. An old Latin synopsis (Lag. 18 seq.) states that E restored the foundations of Zerubbabel's temple, and an old Greek summary of 'Second Esdras' refers to N as a builder of the Temple (Lag. 84, l. 27: *αὐτὸς ἠξίωσε περὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*). These can scarcely all be based upon the references to the Temple in the Artaxerxes-record in E ii. 18, 20. It is at least noteworthy that, both in E and E, compilers have placed this episode in the history of the Temple, and the different readings in E iv. 12, 14, might be due to the alternative position of the story (see below, § 6 (c)) after the account of the opposition in the time of Cyrus.¹ Moreover, the mention of the 'decree of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia' (E vi. 14, see E vii. 4) is unintelligible—for even a gloss or interpolation must express some plausible belief—unless there was a tradition associating Artaxerxes with the building of the Temple. Again, in view of the parallels between E iv. and N ii. iv., vi., in the account of the Samaritan opposition, it is surely significant that the abrupt allusion in N ii. 20 to the repudiation of the Samaritans can only be explained in the light of E iv. 3, where the building of the Temple is concerned.² Finally, the E-story represents a period of favour during which the Temple had been restored or repaired through God's mercy and the clemency of Persia (E ix. 8 seq.). This brief 'moment' (v. 8) cannot date back from the decree of Cyrus and the work of Zerubbabel, rather must one read the whole situation—the strengthening of a neglectful community, the furthering of a poor temple—as a supplement to the disorganization and confusion in the story of N's measures. Hence, it may be concluded that there is sufficient evidence for some tradition of a rebuilding of the Temple and of a return in the time of N.

(f) *The recent disaster.* The disaster which explains N's grief, anxiety, and energetic labours may probably be ascribed in part at least to Edom. Friendly or neutral relations between Judah (and its semi-Edomite population, see c) and the 'brother' Edom appear to have continued at a relatively late period, until for some reason Edom is denounced for its unbrotherly conduct.³ The origin of the enmity is generally connected with the fall of Jerusalem in 586. But it cannot be found in the time of Jehoiakim (the conjecture 'Edom' for 'Aram' in 2 *Kings* xxiv. 2 is against *Jer.* xxxv. 11), or of Zedekiah (when Edom was among the allies of Judah; *Jer.* xxvii., *Ezek.* xvii. 11 seqq.); the Chaldeans alone destroyed the Temple, and Jews had even taken refuge in Edom and elsewhere (*Jer.* xl. 11). The very explicit statement that the Edomites burned the Temple 'when Judaea was made desolate by the Chaldeans', and occupied Judaean territory (E iv. 45, 50), points to the reality of a tradition which, however, has been connected with the events of 586. The various allusions to Edom (*Obad.*, *Ezek.* xxxv. 12, xxxv. 10, 12, xxxvi. 5, *Lam.* iv., *Ps.* cxxxvii. 7), though possibly referring to different periods, cannot be based upon the history of the Chaldean invasion. The very circumstantial references to Edomite aggression (E iv. 50, *Ezek.* xxxv. 10, xxxvi. 3, 5) have led to the view that the Jewish exiles recovered their land through Persian aid.⁴ This, however, finds no support in the history of either Cyrus or Darius. But may it not be later (Nikel, 57 n. 1), before

¹ See also Sellin, *Ser.* 56 n. 1, 58; *Stud.* 18 seq.; Grünhut, *Einleitung* (cited by Jampel, i. 105).

² Parallel traditions elsewhere explain each other, cf. *Ex.* xvii. 6 with *Num.* xx. 8; *Ex.* xvii. 10 with *Num.* xiv. 40, 44; *Ex.* xxxiii. with *Num.* xi.

³ *Mal.* i. 2-5; see Kennett, *Essays*, 117.

⁴ See the discussions of Ewald, 80 seqq., 88; Herzfeld, *Gesch.* (1847) i. 475 seq.; Smend, 22, 24; Stade, *Gesch.* ii. 112; F. Buhl, *Gesch. d. Edomiter* (1893), 77.

I ESDRAS

the prophecy of Mal. i. 2-5, and between the times of Zerubbabel and N?¹ If so, it is tempting to associate the relatively simple and unadorned decree attributed to Darius in *E* iv. 48-56 (which points to a return to rebuild the Temple after a period of Edomite hostility) with the situation that underlies the narratives of N, cf. *d* above.

(*g*) *Summary.* The internal difficulties of E-N are exceedingly complex owing to the numerous untrustworthy features, the remarkable and suspicious parallels, and the intricacies of rearrangement, adjustment, and revision. The sources throw little (if any) light on the period before the return of N, and traditions originally associated with him or his age appear to underlie the rest.² His story forms the starting-point for the problems of E-N, but it has too many serious difficulties for any confident theory of the order of events. Yet it seems clear that in N's time there had not as yet been any previous Samaritan hostility of any extent, any separation from the 'heathen', any important return of exiles. It is not improbable that in the time of Zerubbabel there was a monarchy of some size (cf. Sellin, *Ser.*, 89), and it is interesting to notice that the Samaritan opposition in the time of Artaxerxes is aimed especially at the apparent political pretensions of N (ii. 19, vi. 6-8, cf. *E* iv. 13). The population in and around Jerusalem consisted partly of the old indigenous stock and partly of the southern groups of Edomite affinity who moved northwards after 586. This semi-Edomite people had suffered from a disaster, due, in some measure, to the 'brother' Edomites who had burned the Temple and occupied Jewish territory, and to repair the lamentable conditions was the object of N's return. The southern groups in question are only to be expected after 1 Chron. ii. and iv., and the history in Chron. seems to reveal some traces of their perspective: their presence in the Levitical bodies, the stories of the reconstruction of Temple and cult, and the traditions of invasions of hostile southern peoples. On independent grounds it is probable that other traces of the presence and prominence of these groups may be observed elsewhere, and we may notice that the O. T. preserves the tradition of the high reputation of the eponymous Caleb, the 'servant of Yahweh', and that late traditions even ascribe a southern origin to some of the prophets.³

In the chronicler's compilation the rise of the new Jewish Church and the opposition of the Samaritans are dated at the commencement of the Persian age, and in the light of this the later history was meant to be read, even as other writers presuppose the patriarchal ancestors of pre-Mosaic days or the elaborate Levitical ritual associated with Moses and Aaron. Although this view shapes the compilation, the study of the age of Artaxerxes throws a different light upon its value. There are persistent and independent traditions of some return in his reign, and of some reconstruction of the people. Subsequent to the situation represented in N iii. (see *c* above) a new community was formed, and since it would be composed of elements of exilic (Babylonian) and non-exilic ancestry, some of the names of the latter class (found e.g. in N iii.) might naturally recur in (the later) lists referring to earlier periods (for such names, see Nikel, 154 seqq.). From 1 Chron. ii. and iv., and from the place of Caleb and Jerahmeel among the 'sons' of Perez—Gen. xxxviii seems to record his superiority over the rival and semi-Edomite Zerah—it is obvious that there has been a genealogical readjustment of the groups of southern origin. Moreover, elsewhere, the specific traditions of such groups as these have been revised or mutilated, and it is probable that all these features may be connected with the intricate development of the priestly and Levitical figures, suggestive of rival representations and compromise.⁴

E-N is written from the standpoint of a reorganized community which admitted no relationship with the semi-Edomite or native Judaeans groups. The Babylonian exiles piqued themselves on their superiority to the Judaeans, who none the less could boast of their father Abraham—the hero of the Calebite city of Hebron (Ezek. xxxiii. 24). To the exiles from Babylon and thence (*E* ii.) to the old Judah which fell in 586, the community persistently attributed its origin. The Jews of the post-exilic theocracy laid most weight upon an ancestry from the deportation by Nebuchadnezzar, even as the old Israel ignored the large indigenous and mixed element in Palestine, and descent was claimed from the immigrant tribes from Egypt and thence from the pre-Mosaic sons of Israel. Different disasters were focussed upon 586, and traditions of return and rebuilding were concentrated upon the return of Zerubbabel. Consequently, by thus passing over the native groups, whether akin or not to the hated Edomites, the mixed origin of the Jews was rendered less conspicuous. The significance of this has been well pointed out by Torrey (155, 236 seqq., 321 seqq., and,

¹ Some later Edomite invasion has been inferred by J. Ley, *II. Jesaja* (1893), 150; T. K. Cheyne, *Introd. Is.*, 210 seq.; *E. B.* col. 2701; H. Winckler, *Keilinschr. u. d. A. T.* 295; R. H. Kennet, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, 1906, p. 487. Note also the earlier views of Kuenen and Sellin (*Ser.*, 82) that Is. lxiii. 18, lxiv. 10 seqq., point to another destruction of the Temple after 516.

² Note the tradition in 2 Macc. ii. 13 that N collected writings and 'letters of kings about sacred gifts'.

³ Habakkuk and Zephaniah of Simeon, Obadiah an Edomite proselyte, Nahum of Elkosh.

⁴ See further *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., art. 'Genesis' (xi. 584 seqq.); 'Jews' (xv. 387, 389-91); 'Levites' (xvi. 513 seqq.); 'Palestine' (xx. 615 seqq.), and art. 'Edomites' in Hastings' *Dict. of Rel. and Ethics*.

INTRODUCTION

especially, 328 n. 53). Both Jews and Samaritans were of mingled ancestry, but the latter could at all events claim to have been associated with the land longer than the former. The question of kinship between the two divisions was, as we see from Jos. (ix. 14 3, xi. 8 6, xii. 5 5), always a debatable one, and the knowledge of past history would only increase the bitter enmity at the rise of the rival cult on Mt. Gerizim. But the chronicler's compilation very carefully conceals the course of events and upholds for Judah alone the sole right to be the legitimate descendant of the ancient confederation of Israel.¹

§ 6. STRUCTURE OF THE SOURCES.

It may often be possible to point out conflicting data, to indicate traditions which seem to be older or more original, and to arrive at positive or negative conclusions regarding the underlying facts; but the endeavour to trace the literary growth of complex sources which are certainly the result of intricate reshaping and revision is a delicate problem of literary criticism and distinct from the historical criticism of the period they describe.

(a) *The Sheshbazzar-Cyrus Tradition.* The story of Zerubbabel and the first return of the Jews in the time of Darius (*E* iii. 1-v. 6) is the pivot upon which the problems turn. Our starting-point is the Aramaic section *E* v. seq., where Darius confirms and extends a decree of Cyrus, who had ordered the rebuilding of the Temple and had sent back the vessels with Sheshbazzar (v. 13-15). This tradition is supported by *E* i., which refers also to Mithredath the treasurer who apparently was once mentioned in *E* v. (see on *E* vi. 18). But *E* i. is written in a different style and in Hebrew: it gives a highly-coloured form of the decree (note the parallels with the story of *E*. Marq. 56, Torrey, 157 seq.), and tends to minimize the importance of Cyrus by emphasizing the direct influence of Yahweh (contrast the initiative of Darius in *E* iv., *E* vi. 8-11; see also on *E* vii. 1). Consequently, *E* v. seq., which have various marks of incompleteness (see on *E* vi. 7 seq., 23), presuppose an account of Cyrus and the return of Sheshbazzar (probably also in Aramaic), some part of which at least has been replaced by *E* i. Further, Sheshbazzar returned to build the Temple, but instead of any account of his work, Jeshua and Zerubbabel are abruptly introduced in the great list, *E* ii. 2. These two erect the altar (iii. 2), and (mentioned in the inverse order) commence the rebuilding (iii. 8-10), repulse the 'adversaries' (iv. 2 seq.), and subsequently, in the time of Darius, are encouraged by the prophets to begin operations (v. 2, note the repetition of the ancestry). Zer., as in *E* iii. 1-v. 6, is the leading figure, whereas the Shesh. tradition in v. seq. refers to the 'elders' (*E* v. 5, 9, vi. 8, 14; in vi. 7 C° omits the unnamed governor, see Berth., 19). From the point of view of historical criticism Shesh. and Zer. are two distinct individuals, but it seems obvious that the compiler of *E* i.-vi. regarded them as the same, although it was left for ancient and modern harmonists to make the identification. And in fact it is implied and made in *E* vi. 18, 27, 29, after the introduction of Zer. in iii. seq., but naturally not in *E* ii. 1-15 (= *E* i.); yet in *E*, strangely enough, it is nowhere made, although the return of Shesh. in *E* i. 11 evidently corresponds to the appearance of Zer. in ii. 2 (|| *E* v. 8 immediately after the Zer. story). Hence Jos. is obliged to harmonize (xi. I § 14, 3 § 32). Moreover, it is noteworthy that the Aramaic sources (v. 3-vi. 12) do not clearly indicate that the Jewish builders were exiles (contrast *E* iv. 12), and that there is no explicit reference in *E* v. 15 to any return of exiles under Sheshbazzar; on the other hand, the conflate text of *E* vi. 5, 8 clearly alludes to the Jews as being of the Captivity (cf. vii. 6, 10), and *E* ii. 15 shows more distinctly than *E* i. 11 that exiles returned with Shesh. That there is a gap after this verse has often been suspected. Accordingly, there are two important features: (1) the Shesh. tradition has been mutilated and otherwise adjusted in order to give the greater prominence to Zer. and his return, and (2) while it is not certain that Shesh. was originally the leader of a band of exiles, the text in *E* partly identifies him with the more illustrious Zer., and partly seems to treat his return as that of the 'captivity' also. Finally, the Shesh. tradition is that of a continuous building of the Temple since the time of Cyrus (*E* v. 16). This may be supported by *E* iv. 4, 5, which refer to unceasing troubles and intrigues, and by v. 6, where the accusation in the reign of Ahasuerus means, in this context, that the Temple was still under construction. On the other hand, the presence of the Artaxerxes-episode would imply that the work was definitely brought to a stop (see iv. 21-24), and with this agrees the statement in v. 2 that Zer. and Jeshua, encouraged by the prophets, 'rose up . . . and began to build the house of God'. Since the presence of these conflicting views can hardly be original, the Artaxerxes-episode and the cessation of the building may probably be regarded as foreign to the Shesh. tradition. Hence, although *E* does not present *E*'s remarkable confusion of the sequence of events in the reigns of Cyrus and Darius—a confusion which Jos. has

¹ In so far as the foregoing paragraphs bear upon the prophetic writings, it must be remembered that the dates of the latter depend upon our knowledge of the historical conditions in the light of which they are to be explained.

I ESDRAS

done his best to remedy—it contains, on closer inspection, a very singular combination of conflicting traditions of the Temple, and of Shesh, and Zer.

(b) *The Zerubbabel-Darius tradition.* Since Jewish tradition has it that Darius was the son of Ahasuerus the Mede (Dan. ix. 1), and the Ahasuerus in Esth. was called Artaxerxes (although, historically, Xerxes must be meant), and since the sequence Art.-Darius is true of Art. I-Dar. II (or even of Art. III-Dar. III), compilers might be justified in placing the story of the opposition before a tradition of Darius, whether in *E* ii. 16 seqq., iii., or *E* iv. 7-24, v. But it is not easy to decide which of the two is the earlier position. The cessation of the building of the Temple would be intelligible before *E* iv., which really describes a new era in the history, and would equally agree with the commencement of work mentioned in *E* v. 2. In either case it leads up to Zerubbabel. But whereas in *E* it forms a necessary link between Cyrus and Darius, in *E* it breaks the connexion (iv. 5, v. 1) and conflicts with the Shesh. tradition. The assumption that *E* gives the older position of the episode may be suggested by the fact that its text presents some features distinctly sounder than that in *E* iv. (note, however, the textual relation of Chron. to Sam.-Kings). On the other hand, in *E* v. 66 seqq. (*E* iv. 1 seqq.) the compiler has made use of iv. 1-5, 24, and it is possible that he found iv. (6?) 7-24 before him, but naturally omitted the passage he had already used. In any case, iv. 1-5 is obviously most closely connected with the preceding chapters, and since these presuppose certain material found only in *E* iii. 1-v. 6, *E*'s account of Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel in the time of Cyrus thus presupposes data in *E* of the time of Darius! The simplest explanation of these intricacies is that the MT has suffered by excision (see Torrey, 27 seq.), and it remains to determine whether the material in question originally belonged to the Darius period (as in *E*) or to that of Cyrus (as in *E*). Torrey alone has discussed this problem, and he has presented a complete, clever, and attractive hypothesis. He treats the Darius-Zer. story in *E* iii. 1-iv. 42 as an interpolation in the history of Cyrus, rejects or emends all that is impossible in such a context, and regards *E* ii. 16 seqq. as a transposition from *E* iv. made by the interpolator (see p. 32). But this leaves the complexity of *E* i.-vi. untouched. It treats as redactional certain passages that have by no means that appearance (viz. *E* iv. 43-7a, 57-61), and if *E* iv. 7-24 was deliberately borrowed, it is strange that no effort was made to form a reasonable link between ii. 15 and 16, as Jos. has done. The compiler used *E* ii. 16 seqq. to link Cyrus and Darius, but this theory assumes that for no apparent reason whatsoever a story of Darius has been introduced into the Cyrus-history and combined with it by (redactional?) material, which is partly of considerable independent value, and partly introduces a *new* tradition of Cyrus (iv. 44, 57) in conflict with all other evidence. The story, moreover, would hardly have been used in Jewish history unless it was associated with Zerubbabel, Darius, and the return of the Jews; hence its presence, general character, independence, and the confusion arising from the attempt to unite it with *other* traditions plead for the view (also held by Howorth and Bayer) that it is original.

(c) *Result of combination.* On this alternative theory, then, *E* preserves a Zer.-Darius nucleus corresponding to a Shesh.-Cyrus nucleus in *E*, and it seems probable that the intricacies in *E* and *E* have arisen from the endeavour to combine and compromise. *E* iii. 1-v. 6 commence like an independent story, presupposes no prelude, and quite excludes any current story of Cyrus. iv. 44, 57, it is true, refer to his inability to fulfil a vow, but this has neither any foundation in history nor support in extant tradition, and appears to be an early effort to connect the section with Cyrus. Thenceforth we apparently have the building-up of narratives. The Artaxerxes episode was taken from a source relating to the time of N (§ 5^b), and the sequel of the story, the list v. 7 seqq., also has a Nehemiah background. The connexion between v. 1-6 and 7 seqq. is not close (note repetition 4, 7a, the preliminary vv. 5 and 7), and it is possible that iii. 1-v. 6 once had another sequel, or that there has been later adjustment. In any case, the references to Cyrus (iv. 44, 57), the treatment of the Shesh. tradition, and the fact that *E* ii. 1-15 are not in their original form, unite to show that there has been much revision, the stages in which cannot be traced. The list itself, partly connected with *E*'s return in N vii., has been applied to the return of Zer., and then treated (in N) by the compiler of *E*-N as a quotation from the earlier period. It presents a materially older text, and its immediate continuation in *E* v. 47 seqq. (*E* iii.) is also based upon N viii. 1, and describes events in which one may recognize the influence of other passages in N (Meyer, 73, 99; Marq., 58 seq.; Volz, § 9). But the material is adjusted to Zerubbabel and Cyrus, with the result that while *E* v. 8 (the introduction of Zer.) is explained by the preceding story, and v. 47 (the date) by v. 6; v. 55 has in view iv. 48 (Darius), but its context is of the time of Cyrus (note the harmonizing efforts of Jos., xi. 4, 1, 3 seq.).

Haggai and Zech., in the second year of Darius, know of no return or earlier rebuilding. So far this agrees with the Zer. story, which, however, while excluding any earlier rebuilding, describes the first return of the Jews. The Shesh. story throws back the commencement of the temple, but in *E* does not clearly point to

INTRODUCTION

any return (contrast *E*). In so far as Darius is concerned, these stories are mutually contradictory, and neither is supported by the prophets, and in so far as the fortunes of the temple are concerned, it is possible that a compromise was found in the belief that the work was brought to a stop and that the building was re-commenced in the time of Darius. This explains the motive of the Artaxerxes episode, and if the references to the Temple in *E* ii. 18, 20 are reliable, their absence in *E* iv. 12, 14 may be due to its new position. Further, if *E* v. 1 once had (as in *E* vi. 1) the precise date, this would be in order after iv. 5 (see Berth., 19), but might naturally be omitted after the insertion of iv. (6) 7-24; and since also the retention of the date in *E* vi. 1 would be unnecessary after v. 73 (= *E* iv. 24), the present unintelligible wording of the latter *versus* may be due to intentional alteration and not to corruption of the text. Thus, *E* partly presents material in an older text and form than *E*, partly shows signs of revision (apparently in the Greek), either to harmonize details or to conform with the MT, and partly is influenced by the form of *E*, whose imperfections it shares. The root of the problem lies in the two nuclei: Zerubbabel-Darius, Sheshbazzar-Cyrus-Darius, and in the endeavour to co-ordinate them; but in addition to the complexity touching Cyrus and Darius, it is obvious that the present form of the narratives cannot be viewed apart from the literary treatment of the events of the time of Artaxerxes.

(d) *The Ezra-story.* The narratives involved are an account of N's work, partly autobiographical, but now in a much revised and intricate form, which is divided by the *E*-story, also not from one hand, and itself split into two. These have suffered various changes and adjustments in the course of being combined with each other and with the great history of the 'chronicler'. On both literary and historical grounds we may postulate a stage when the whole of the *E*-story was found after the first appearance of N (p. 9 *d*). To suppose that N viii.-x. also once stood before N i. (Torrey, 265 seq.) only increases the difficulties. *E* appears relatively late in tradition, but continues to grow in reputation. He is absent from both Ben Sira xlix. 12 seq. and 2 Macc. i. seq., and here N is particularly prominent; but N's prominence, though in agreement with all the evidence, has not been made so obvious in the *E*-story (see § 4. III. *d*). Moreover, the effort has apparently been made to give greater significance to *E* by placing the most important part of his mission—the Reading of the Law (and the sequel, the Covenant)—in the account of the completion of the walls of Jerusalem, and also by introducing the rest of the story before N's arrival. *E* has gone further, and in ix. 37 seqq. has read part of N viii. after *E* x. Now, although *E* presents in some cases a better text, it is noteworthy that in reproducing N viii. and the introductory vii. 73^b, the compiler has also unnecessarily removed v. 73^a, which can hardly stand after *E* ix. 36 = *E* x. 44 (cf. Volz, 1492). This deliberate transference perhaps explains the text in *ṣṣ*. 38, 49, and suggests that *E*'s recension is here based upon the MT, with the *E*-story divided as at present. Consequently, both *E* and *E*-N share that complicated treatment of the purification of Israel which seems to have arisen when the story of *E* was rearranged. It is uncertain how *E*, if more complete, would have continued. There is indeed some evidence, perhaps not of great value, for an account of *E*'s passover, suggesting that some portion of the story has been lost (see on ix. 35). However, if the whole of the *present* story had been placed before N i., both N i.-vi., xi.-xiii. and *E* vii.-x., N viii.-x. (or in any rearranged form) would still be in a confused, and certainly not original shape. The one source which actually effects this transposition is Jos., who finishes the life of *E* before dealing with N. His treatment is brief and paraphrastic, but it seems to be extremely significant that he does not point to the existence of the story of N in either the form or the sequence which it now has. To reconstruct the continuation of *E* is to make the overlapping with N more conspicuous; this is clear from the synopses cited below on p. 58, and it is interesting to notice that an old Syriac catena, which follows *E*, endeavours to readjust to N—it passes from *E* ix. 1-10 to 46^b-47 (= N viii. 6) and thence to N i. 1-4, and places the Reading of the Law (N viii.) in the context it now has in the MT. *E*, it is evident, does not enable us to go behind the MT, but, together with Jos., it tends to show that the MT is the late outcome of a very intricate literary development.

(e) *The Compilation.* At the stage when the stories of *E* and N were shaped in their present form, and when the traditions of the time of Artaxerxes had been used directly or indirectly for the age of Cyrus and Darius, we reach the complete historical work Chron.-*E*-N., and the structure of *E*-N really involves close attention to that of Chron. itself. Here it must suffice to observe that both Chron. and *E*-N furnish evidence representing different stages in the vicissitudes of the priests and Levites (see on *E* viii. 28), and it is noteworthy that there are several traces of textual variation and confusion where these are concerned (see, e.g., i. 5 seqq., 10, 15, v. 56, vii. 9, viii. 42, ix. 43 seqq.). It is also significant of the relative lateness of *E*-N that the age at which the Levites serve agrees with *secondary* passages in Chron. (see on v. 58), and that an apparent anti-Aaronite bias has found its way into both (see on vii. 10-12). Perhaps the most important feature in the compilation is the presence of gaps (e.g. before *E* v. 1, N i.), the more striking when we observe that the chronicler has ignored pertinent material in Kings, Jer., Daniel, and Esther. The book of Daniel was familiar in the Greek age and later (cf. 1 Macc. ii. 59 seq., and, for the Targums, *Prot. Realeucy.*, iii. 107 seq.),

I ESDRAS

and was used by Jos. The story in *E* iii. seq. has literary points of contact with both Dan. and Est. (Marq. 66, 68, 72; Torrey, 47 seq.; Bayer, 110 seqq.), and the former of these records traditions of the Temple-vessels (see on ii. 10).¹ The sacrilegious use of the holy objects by Belshazzar was followed by the fall of Babylon to the Medes and Persians, and forthwith *Darius the Mede*, son of Ahasuerus, became king (v. 31, ix. 1). He was led to proclaim the God of Daniel (vi. 25-7), and to the first year of his reign is ascribed the prayer of Daniel (ix.). Here, the seventy years of desolation foretold by Jeremiah are complete, and Daniel prays on behalf of the Jews in Jerusalem and afar off, and on behalf of the ruined sanctuary. The tradition—irrespective of its present setting—is so far in harmony with *E* iii. seq., the story of Zerubbabel in the second year of Darius (cf. Büchler, 7 seq.), where, as in Daniel's prayer, an earlier return is excluded. It is difficult not to believe that these traditions are related, and it is noteworthy that while the references to Cyrus in the story of Zerubbabel appear to be due to later revision, Cyrus, according to Dan. vi. 28, x. 1, reigned after Darius. Thus, not only is it more intelligible that the Cyrus tradition is relatively the later, and probably grew out of the Darius tradition, than the reverse, but a tradition evidently once prevailed which placed Darius before Cyrus.

But it was also known that Cyrus preceded Darius, and in Bel and the Dragon he follows after Astyages (see above, p. 11) and—like Darius in Dan. vi.—becomes convinced of Daniel's God. This correct sequence is that represented by Jos. and the 'chronicler', with one important difference, that while the former does his best to combine all the varying traditions of Cyrus and Darius, the present MT ignores Dan. and *E* iii. 1-6 and the complications these would introduce into the history. Accuracy of sequence does not necessarily prove greater antiquity of source. It depends upon accuracy of information, and if Jos. (xi. 2) knows that Cambyses and not Artaxerxes (*E* ii. 16 seqq.) reigned before Darius, he is confused in his treatment of Xerxes and Artaxerxes, and while the chronicler wrongly retains these two between Cyrus and Darius, he has, however, avoided the incorrect sequence of the latter two in Daniel. The traditions of this period (§ 4 IV. c.) combine in an inextricable manner trustworthy and untrustworthy data with the result that mere mechanical rearrangement of material or correction of names is inadequate for the recovery of the historical facts. Whether or no there was a continuous chronicle of the Kings of Media and Persia (Est. x. 2), if a compiler of Jewish history followed the tradition which also appears in Dan., Darius the Mede reigned before Cyrus, and Darius, after *E* iii. seq., was the first to permit the Jews to return. On the other hand, Cyrus was really the first king, and it is easy to understand the endeavours to adjust the traditions. It may not be possible to trace all the steps in the process, nevertheless, *E*'s recension is a valuable witness to the efforts made to effect a compromise, and it is significant that while all the evidence points to the relative lateness of the Cyrus tradition in the form it now has in *E* ii. 1-15 or *E* i., the immediate prelude in *E* i. represents a text materially older in some respects (though more corrupt in others) than the corresponding 2 Chron. xxxv. seq.

(f) *Conclusion.* In the nature of the case, any explanation of the structure of *E* and E-N must be a provisional one. At all events, Bayer's view (93 seq., 102, 139), that *E* is a secondary and deliberate self-contained compilation dealing with the Temple, is inadequate, in that it accounts for only a small proportion of the textual features. Howorth, whose merit it has been to force the attention of biblical students to the importance of *E*, undoubtedly goes too far in championing the textual and historical value of *E*. As regards its text, used by Jahn with a certain lack of discrimination and by Bayer somewhat unduly underestimated, Torrey and Volz support an intermediate position, pointing out the general relative superiority of MT. Torrey justly observes, also, that as a history *E* is not in its original form, and he has proposed a hypothesis of its relationship with E-N which he works out with much skill and thoroughness (18 seqq., 30 seqq., 255 seqq.). He starts from the chronicler's history in almost its present form (dated c. third cent. B.C.), and assumes two important changes: (1) the transference of N vii. 70-x. 39 from their 'original' position between *E* viii. and ix. to the place where they now stand, and (2) the interpolation of the story *E* iii. 1-iv. 42, in the history of *Cyrus*, with redactional expansion, alteration, &c., and with the transposition of the Artaxerxes episode from *E* iv. 6-24 to *E* ii. 16-30. Subsequently, two rival forms arose: one (A) with the retransposition of N vii. 73-x. 40, this time between *E* x. and N i.; the other (B) with the excision of the Story of the Three Youths (*E* iii. seq.) together with a part of the 'original' history. The latter is represented by the MT; the former, after being translated into Greek, survives only in the fragmentary *E*, which is defined as 'simply a piece taken without change out of the middle of a faithful Greek translation of the chronicler's History of Israel in the form which was generally recognized as authentic in the last century B.C.' (18). This hypothesis is complicated (see Bayer's criticisms, 143 seq.), though not unduly so. On the other hand, there are objections to the view that

¹ It is disputed whether *E* iii. seq. is later than these (Bayer, 128 seq.), or earlier (Torrey); in any case the canonical books, whatever their date, may well incorporate or be based upon older traditions.

INTRODUCTION

the Story of the Three Youths is an interpolation in the alleged original Cyrus-history, viz. in E i., E iv. 47-56, iv. 62-v. 6, E ii. seqq. (see p. 16), and to the assumption that the place of the E-story before N i. is the earlier (see p. 17). Further, although E is obviously imperfect, to restore a complete work in which it should correspond to E in the chronicler's series necessitates the belief that Jos., the only early source which places the E-story before N, is witness to the MT form of the stories of both E and N, and this cannot be said to be certain (see p. 57 seq.). The latter part of E presupposes the present structure of E vii.-x., N . . . vii. 73-viii. 13 . . ., whereas the first half presents older traits in i., ii. 16 seqq. (the position of the Artaxerxes episode), iii. 1-v. 6 (the Zerubbabel story), v. 7-70 (the background of the list, E ii.), and v. 71 (the immediate sequel, the prelude to the work of the returned exiles). Finally, the criticism of E inevitably raises the problem of the entire series Chron.-E-N, which at one stage was a literary whole, and consequently we cannot take the chronicler's history as a fixed starting-point. As a matter of fact, apart from the literary questions arising out of Chronicles alone, it seems that the books were regarded by the Rabbis with some suspicion (Curtis and Madsen, *Chron.* 2), and now stand after E-N 'as if it were an afterthought to admit them to equal authority' (W. R. Smith, *Old Test. Jew. Church*, 182). It is not improbable that this severance involved some subsequent alteration and revision (cf. Marq., 29). Moreover, the recurrence of 1 Chron. ix., N xi., in a single work hardly looks like an original feature; like the more remarkable repetition of the list E ii., N vii. (see Jampel, i. 366; Howorth, *PSBA*, xxvi. 26; Holzhey, 37 n. 2) the feature seems to point to the combination of sources which were primarily distinct.

All the data suggest that E and E-N represent concurrent forms which have influenced each other in the earlier stages of their growth. They are rivals, and neither can be said to be wholly older or more historical than the other. The endeavour was made to correct E to agree with the MT—and G^b is a conspicuous example of the extent to which the revisers could go—and the presence of such efforts and in particular the doublets (see § 3 b) are of essential importance in indicating that E's text does not precisely represent a Heb.-Aram. work, and that when all allowance is made for correction and revision of the Greek, problems of the underlying original text still remain. But it was impossible to make any very satisfactory adjustment, E diverged too seriously from the MT, which had cut the chronological knot by the excision of the story of Zerubbabel, and we may suppose that this facilitated the desire for the more literal translation of Theodotion (p. 3 seq.).

§ 7. VALUE.

Although our O.T. has lost the story of Zerubbabel and the Praise of Truth, there is no doubt that there is something 'unbiblical' in the orations. In the course of the growth of the O.T., compilers and revisers have not unfrequently obscured or omitted that to which they took exception, and some light is thus often thrown upon other phases of contemporary Palestinian or Jewish thought. While the orations themselves remind us of the old 'Wisdom' literature (Proverbs, Ben Sira, Wisdom), their combination with narrative will recall the interesting story of Ahikar. E remains 'apocryphal' in so far as it was deliberately rejected by Jewish and Christian schools. It had indeed found a place in the Bible of the Greek-speaking Jews, and was familiar to Jews and Christians, either indirectly through Jos., or directly as a separate work. To the Christians the prominence of Zerubbabel must have been of no little interest (see § 1, end). But the value of E does not lie merely in this story. The book (or fragment) furnishes useful evidence for the criticism of the text and contents of the canonical passages, and illustrates methods of compilation and revision, swing of traditions, and play of motives. It clearly indicates the importance of the comparison of related traditions as apart from the ultimate question of the underlying facts, and shows, in conjunction with Jos., how a relatively straightforward account of history as in E-N may be the last stage in the effort to cut the knots formed by imperfect compilation. In its final form, the MT, the result of 'Rabbinical redaction' (Marq., 29), is ascribed by Howorth to the School of Jamnia in the time of Rabbi Akiba (*PSBA*, xxvi. 25), and although it is difficult to find decisive arguments in favour of this conjecture—or against it—it is not impossible that the chronicler's history, as it now reads, may be dated about the beginning of the Christian era. It is significant that it is wanting in the Syriac Peshitta. Such a view, it should be observed, no more expresses an opinion on the dates of the component sources or sections than it would were the work in question a composite and much edited portion of Mishnah or Midrash.

§ 8. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS.

- A, B = Codices of the Greek version.
André, L. E. T. = *Les Apocryphes de l'A. T.* (1903).
Ball, C. J. = *The Variorum Apocrypha* (1896).

I ESDRAS

- Bayer, E. = 'Das dritte Buch Esdras und sein Verhältnis zu den Büchern Esra-Nehemia', in *Biblische Studien*, ed. Bardenhever, vol. xvi. (1911).
- Bertholet, A. = *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia* (1902).
- Büchler, A. = 'Das apokryphische Esrabuch', *MGWJ*, xli. (1897), 1-16, 49-66, 97-103.
- Charles, R. H. = 'Third Book of Ezra', *Ency. Brit.* 11th ed., vol. x. 104-6.
- Cheyne, T. K. = *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895). *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile* (1898). See also *sub* Kosters.
- Davies, T. W. = 'Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther', *The Century Bible* (1909).
- Driver, S. R. = *Introd. to the Lit. of the O.T.* (1909).
- E = Ezra (the book or man).
- E = 1 Esdras.
- E. Bi.* = *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1899-1903).
- Ew. = Ewald, H., *History of Israel*, 2nd ed. (1880), vol. v.
- Fr. = Fritzsche, O. F., Comment. on 1 Esdras in *Kurzgef. exeget. Handbuch* (1851).
- ☞ = Greek version.
- ☞ Chron., ☞ E, &c. (or Chron. ☞, E☞, &c.) = Greek version of Chronicles, Ezra, &c.
- ☞^{MAN} = Codices of the Greek.
- Geissler, J. = *Die literarischen Beziehungen der Esramemoiren* (1899).
- Guthe, H. = 1 Esdras, in Kautsch, *Die Apok. u. Pseudepig. d. A. T.* (1898). See also *SBOT*.
- Holzhey, C. = *Bücher Esra u. Nehemia* (1902).
- Hoonacker, A. van = *Nehémie et Esdras* (1890). *Zerubabel et le second Temple* (1892). *Nouvelles Études sur la Restauration juive* (1895). Articles in *Revue Biblique*, 1901, January, April.
- Howorth, Sir Henry H. = *Academy*, 1893, January-July (*passim*), *Transactions of Oriental Congress, London*, ii. 69-85 (1893). *Proceedings of Soc. of Bibl. Archaeology*, 1901-10 (*passim*).
- Jahn, C. = *Die Bücher Esra (A u. B) u. Nehemia* (1909).
- Jampel, S. = 'Die Wiederherstellung Israels unter den Achämeniden', *MGWJ*, xlii. and xlvii. (1902-3); here cited as i. and ii.
- Jos. = Josephus, ed. Niese.
- Kennett, R. H. = 'Hist. of the Jew. Church from Nebuchadnezzar to Alexander', *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (ed. Swete, 1909), 91-135. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1905, January, 161-86; 1906, July, 481-500.
- Kent, C. F. = *Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives* (1905).
- Kosters, W. H. = *Die Wiederherstellung Israels in der persischen Periode* (Germ. ed., by Basedow, 1895).
- " *Th. T.* = Articles in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, xxix. (1895), 549 seqq.; xxx. (1896), 489 seqq., 580 seqq.; xxxi. (1897), 518 seqq.
- " *E. Bi.* = Articles 'Cyrus', 'Ezra', 'Ezra-Nehemiah', 'Nehemiah' (with additions by T. K. Cheyne), in *E. Bi.*
- L = Lucian's recension of the Greek version.
- ℒ, ℒℒ Lag. = Latin Versions, see above, § 3 c.
- Lag. = Lagarde, P. de, *Septuaginta-Studien*, ii. (1892).
- Lupton, J. H. = 1 Esdras in *The Apocrypha*, ed. H. Wace (1888).
- Marq. = J. Marquart, *Fundamente israel. u. jud. Geschichte*, pp. 28-68 (1896).
- Meyer, E. = *Die Entstehung des Judentums* (1896).
- " *Jr.* = *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906), by E. Meyer and B. Luther.
- MGWJ* = *Monatschrift f. Gesch. u. Wissenschaft des Judentums*.
- Moulton = 'Über die Überlieferung u. d. textkritischen Wert d. III. Esr.' in *ZATW*, xix. 209-58 (1899); xx. 1-35 (1900).
- MT = Massoretic Text.
- N = Nehemiah (the book or man).
- Nestle, E. = *Marginalien u. Materialien* (1893), 23 seqq.
- Nikel, J. = 'Die Wiederherstellung des jüd. Gemeinwesens nach den bab. Exil', in *Biblische Studien*, ed. Bardenhever, vol. v (1900).
- Pöhlmann = 'Über das Ansehen des apokryphen Buches Esra', *Tübinger Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1859.
- PSBA* = *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*.
- Ryle, H. E. = 'Ezra and Nehemiah' in the *Cambridge Bible* (1901).
- ☞ = Syriac version.
- Sachau, E. = 'Drei aram. Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine' (*Abhandl. königl.-preuss. Akad. Berlin*, 1907).
- SBOT* = *The Sacred Books of the O.T.*, ed. P. Haupt: 'Ezra and Nehemiah', by H. Guthe (and, pp. 56-71, L. W. Batten).
- Schrader, E. = 'Die Dauer des zweiten Tempelbaues', *Theolog. Stud. und Kritiken*, 1867, pp. 460 seqq.
- Sellin, E., *Scr.* = *Serubbabel* (1898).
- " *Stud.* = *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte d. jüd. Gemeinde*, vol. ii. (1901).
- Smend, R. = *Die Listen der Bücher Esra u. Nehemia* (1881).
- Smith, G. A. = In *The Expositor*, 1906, June-August.
- Smith, H. P. = *O.T. History* (1903).
- Th. T.* = *Theologisch Tijdschrift*.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. = Art. 'Esdras', *Hastings' Dict. Bible*, i. 758-63.
- Theis, J. = *Gesch. u. literarkrit. Fragen in E i-vi* (1910).
- Torrey, C. C. = *Ezra Studies* (Chicago, 1910).
- " *Comp.* = 'Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah', *Beiheft zur ZATW*, 1896.
- Trendelenburg = 'Apokr. Esra', Eichhorn, *Allgem. Bibl. d. bibl. Litt.* (1787), 178-232.
- Treuenfels = Articles in *Der Orient* (ed. J. Fürst), 1850-1.
- Volz, P. = 'The Greek Esra', *E. Bi.* vol. iv, cols. 1488-94.
- Wellhausen, J. = 'Die Rückkehr der Juden aus dem bab. Exil', in *Nachrichten d. Göttinger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, 1895, pp. 166 seqq. Review of E. Meyer, *Entstehung u.s.w.*, in the *Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1897, pp. 89 seqq.
- ZATW* = *Zeitschrift für Alttest. Wissenschaft*.

I ESDRAS.

ESDRAS

2 CHRON.
36

1 AND Josiah held the passover in Jerusalem unto his Lord, and offered the passover the fourteenth day of the first month; having set the priests according to their daily courses, being arrayed in their vestments, in the temple of the Lord. And he spake unto the Levites, the temple-servants of Israel, that they should hallow themselves unto the Lord, to set the holy ark of the Lord in the house that king Solomon the son of David had built: and said, Ye shall no more have need to bear it upon your shoulders: now therefore serve the Lord your God, and minister unto his people Israel, and prepare you after your fathers' houses and kindreds, according to the writing of David king of Israel, and according to the magnificence of Solomon his son:

and standing in the holy place according to the several divisions of the families of you the Levites, who minister in the presence of your brethren the children of Israel, offer the passover in order, and make ready the sacrifices for your brethren, and keep the passover according to the commandment of the Lord, which was given unto Moses. And unto the people which were present Josias gave thirty thousand lambs and kids, and three thousand calves: these things were given of the king's substance,

according as he promised, to the people, and to the priests and Levites. And Helkias, and Zacharias, and Esyelus, the rulers of the temple, gave to the priests for the passover two thousand and six hundred sheep, and three hundred calves.

And Jeconias, and Samaias, and Nathanael his brother, and Sabias, and Ochielus, and Joram, captains over thousands, gave to the Levites for the passover five thousand sheep, and seven hundred calves.

10 And when these things

AND Josiah kept a passover unto the Lord in Jerusalem: and they killed the passover on the fourteenth day of the first month. And he set the priests in their charges, and encouraged them to the service of the house of the Lord.

And he said unto the Levites that taught all Israel, which were holy unto the Lord, Put the holy ark in the house which Solomon the son of David king of Israel did build; there shall no more be a burden upon your shoulders: now serve the Lord your God, and his people Israel.

And prepare yourselves after your fathers' houses by your courses, according to the writing of David king of Israel, and according to the writing of Solomon his son. And stand in the holy place according to the divisions of the fathers' houses of your brethren the children of the people, and let there be for each a portion of a fathers' house of the Levites. And kill the passover, and sanctify yourselves, and prepare for your brethren, to do according to the word of the Lord by the hand of Moses. And Josiah gave to the children of the people, of the flock, lambs and kids, all of them for the passover offerings, unto all that were present, to the number of thirty thousand, and three thousand bullocks: these were of the king's substance. And his princes gave for a freewill offering unto the people, to the priests, and to the Levites. Ililkiah and Zechariah and Jehiel, the rulers of the house of God, gave unto the priests for the passover offerings two thousand and six hundred small cattle, and three hundred oxen. Conaniah also, and Shemaiah and Nethanel, his brethren, and Hashabiah and Jeiel and Jozabad, the chiefs of the Levites, gave unto the Levites for the passover offerings five thousand small cattle, and five hundred oxen. So the service was prepared,

Josiah's passover and death, the last kings of Judah, and the exile. Ch. i. = 2 Chron. xxxv. seq. (cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 21-xxv. 30 and the relevant portions of Jeremiah), cf. Jos. Ant. x. 4 5-xi. 7 (who uses the canonical books, including Daniel, E, and unknown sources). On the text and contents, see the Comm. on Chronicles, also, for the versions, Moulton, ZATW, xix. 234 seqq. The whole chapter when compared with MT and G of Chron. and Kings furnishes an instructive illustration of the methods and merits of the translator.

2. arrayed (ἱστολισμένοι), cf. v. 59, vii. 9. Perhaps an Aramaizing mistranslation (Nestle, 24).

3. temple-servants, mg. the Nethinim, a misreading of MT עֲבָדֵי יְהוָה. Note the indirect narration in E and Chron. G.

5. magnificence (μεγαλότητα), G (cf. S) and Chron. G^a διὰ χερός, perhaps interpreted 'by the might'. Charles conj. על יד for MT במכתב (a repetition of כתב), misread in E as בגלל (private communication).

The paraphrastic 5-7 represent a rather different MT.

8. Esyelus (G^a Joel), mg. Jehiel (after MT); perhaps Haziel is intended (Fr., Guthe; cf. 1 Chron. xxiii. 9).

were done, the priests and Levites, having the unleavened bread, stood in comely order according to the kindreds,

11 and according to the several divisions by fathers' houses, before the people, to offer to the Lord, as it is written in the book of 12 Moses; and thus *did they* in the morning. And they roasted the passover with fire, as appertaineth: and the sacrifices they sod in the brassen 13 vessels and caldrons with a good savour, and set them before all the people: and afterward they prepared for themselves, and for the priests their 14 brethren, the sons of Aaron. For the priests offered the fat until night: and the Levites prepared for themselves, and for the priests their 15 brethren, the sons of Aaron. The holy singers also, the sons of Asaph, were in their order, according to the appointment of David, *to wit*, 16 Asaph, Zacharias, and Eddinus, who was of the king's retinue. Moreover the porters were at every gate; none had need to depart from his daily course: for their brethren the Levites prepared for them. Thus were the things that belonged to the sacrifices of the Lord accomplished 18 in that day, in holding the passover, and offering sacrifices upon the altar of the Lord, according 19 to the commandment of king Josias. So the children of Israel which were present at that time held the passover, and the feast of unleavened 20 bread seven days. And such a passover was not held in Israel since the time of the prophet 21 Samuel. Yea, all the kings of Israel held not such a passover as Josias, and the priests, and the Levites, and the Jews, held with all Israel that were present in their dwelling place at Jerusalem. 22 In the eighteenth year of the reign of Josias was 23 this passover held. And the works of Josias were upright before his Lord with a heart full of godli- 24 ness. Moreover the things that came to pass in his days have been written in times past, concerning those that sinned, and did wickedly against the Lord above every people and kingdom, and how they grieved him exceedingly, so that the words of the Lord were confirmed against Israel.

and the priests stood in their place, and the Levites by their courses, according to the king's commandment. And they killed the passover, 11 and the priests sprinkled *the blood, which they received* of their hand, and the Levites flayed them. And they removed the burnt offerings, 12 that they might give them according to the divisions of the fathers' houses of the children of the people, to offer unto the Lord, as it is written in the book of Moses. And so did they with the oxen. And they roasted the passover with fire 13 according to the ordinance: and the holy offerings sod they in pots, and in caldrons, and in pans, and carried them quickly to all the children of the people. And afterward they prepared for 14 themselves, and for the priests; because the priests the sons of Aaron *were busied* in offering the burnt offerings and the fat until night: therefore the Levites prepared for themselves, and for the priests the sons of Aaron. And the singers 15 the sons of Asaph were in their place, according to the commandment of David, and Asaph, and Heman, and Jeduthun the king's seer; and the porters were at every gate: they needed not to depart from their service, for their brethren the Levites prepared for them.

So all the service 16 of the Lord was prepared the same day, to keep the passover, and to offer burnt offerings upon the altar of the Lord, according to the commandment of king Josiah. And the children of Israel 17 that were present kept the passover at that time, and the feast of unleavened bread seven days. And there was no passover like to that kept in 18 Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet; neither did any of the kings of Israel keep such a passover as Josiah kept, and the priests, and the Levites, and all Judah and Israel that were present, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. In 19 the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah was this passover kept.

10-12. A good example of misunderstanding and adjustment. **Unleavened bread** = *commandment* (חֻמָּה, for חֻמֵּי), morning (cf. v. 50) = *oxen* (רֶבֶב, \mathfrak{C} in *E* and *Chron.*, for רֶבֶב); **good savour** = *pans* (εὐωδίας for εὐωδίας [cf. A.V. mg.], \mathfrak{C} in *Chron.* εὐωδία); a misunderstanding of the root חָלַץ in חֻמֵּי; for parallels, see *Ecclus.* xliii. 26, *Ascens. Isaiah*, vi. 17, and *Journ. Royal Asiatic Soc.*, 1901, p. 169). For \mathfrak{C} 's text, see Torrey, 107.

15. 'To wit', implying that these choir-masters were at Josiah's passover (cf. *Chron.* \mathfrak{C}) is of course erroneous. **Zacharias**, may be supported by 1 *Chron.* xv. 18, xvi. 5, where he ranks next to Asaph; see Benzinger, *Chron.* 74 was, mg. *were* (\mathfrak{C}). \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{L} + the prophets (so \mathfrak{C} in *Chron.*); some MSS. of MT read 'seers', cf. 1 *Chron.* xxv. 1. 23 seq. An addition partly with reference to 1 *Kings* xiii. 2, 32, 2 *Kings* xxiii. 14 seqq. (see also \mathfrak{C} 's addition in *Chron.*). See further Nestle, 27; Torrey, 88 seq.; Bayer, 95 seq.

24. Better: 'and the things pertaining to him had been written in times past, on account of those . . . and grieved him . . . and the words . . .' (after Ball).

exceedingly (\mathfrak{C} ν *ἐν ἀποθήρῃ* [cf. \mathfrak{S}], \mathfrak{C} τ *ἔρι*), mg. *sensibly*; cf. *Judith* xvi. 17.

confirmed (*ἀειστήσαν*), a Hebraism, cf. *Jer.* xlv. 29.

25 Now after all these acts of Josias it came to pass, that Pharaoh the king of Egypt came to raise war at Carchemish upon Euphrates: and Josias went out against him. But the king of Egypt sent to him, saying, What have I to do with thee, O king of Judaea? I am not sent out from the Lord God against thee; for my war is upon Euphrates: and now the Lord is with me, yea, the Lord is with me hastening me forward: depart from me, and be not against the Lord. Howbeit Josias did not turn back unto his chariot, but undertook to fight with him, not regarding the words of the prophet Jeremy *spoken* by the mouth of the Lord: but joined battle with him in the plain of Megiddo, and the princes came down against king Josias. 30 Then said the king unto his servants, Carry me away out of the battle; for I am very weak. And immediately his servants carried him away out of the host. Then gat he up upon his second chariot; and being brought back to Jerusalem he died, and was buried in the sepulchre of his fathers. And in all Jewry they mourned for Josias; and Jeremy the prophet lamented for Josias, and the chief men with the women made lamentation for him, unto this day: and this was given out for an ordinance to be done continually in all the nation of Israel. These things are written in the book of the histories of the kings of Judaea, and every one of the acts that Josias did, and his glory, and his understanding in the law of the Lord, and the things that he had done before, and the things now *recited*, are reported in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah. 34 And the people took Joachaz the son of Josias, and made him king instead of Josias his father, when he was twenty and three years old. 35 And he reigned in Judah and in Jerusalem three months: and then the king of Egypt deposed him from reigning in Jerusalem. And he set a tax upon the people of a hundred talents of silver and one talent of gold. The king of Egypt also made king Joakim his brother king of Judaea and Jerusalem. And Joakim bound the nobles; but Zarakes his brother he apprehended, and brought him up out of Egypt.

25. Jos. x. 5 1 explains the march of Neco as an attack upon the Medes and Babylonians who had overthrown Assyria. On the Median empire see *Intrad.*, pp. 11 c, 17 e.

26. king of Egypt, based on a misunderstanding of 'messengers' (מַלְאָכִים).

27. upon Euphrates, similarly Jos.

28. unto his chariot, mg. *his chariot from him* (סָוָר).

undertook (so Jos., and G in Chron.), see Torrey, 221; Charles conj. יָחַזַק (private communication).

prophet. Neco (so Jos.) misread (נְבוּזַבְדַּנְשַׁרְדִּין) and plausibly expanded by the addition of the prophet's name.

29. princes came down; another misreading (וַיֵּרְדוּ הַשָּׂרִים) for וַיֵּרְדוּ הַיְרִים with which G Chron. and Jos. agree.

30. host, better 'line of battle'; apparently reading מַעְרָבָה for מַעְרָבָה.

32. chief men; reading שָׂרִים for שָׂרִים.

The dirge, according to Jos., was still extant.

33. With the paraphrase cf. v. 42.

34. Joachaz (i.e. Jehoahaz), but mg. *Jeconias* (i.e. Jechoniah = Jehoiachin, v. 43), so G² L and Matt. i. 11. Jos. x. 5 2 follows G of Chron. with which cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 31-35. All the texts show some confusion here; see the comm.

35. Judah, mg. *Israel* (G² L); G², Jos. . . and MT (with G) omit.

36. Hopeless confusion arising from misreadings of the MT.

After all this, when Josiah had prepared the temple, Neco king of Egypt went up to fight against Carchemish by Euphrates: and Josiah went out against him. But he sent ambassadors to him, saying, What have I to do with thee, thou king of Judah? *I come* not against thee this day, but against the house wherewith I have war; and God hath commanded me to make haste: forbear thee from *meddling* with God, who is with me, that he destroy thee not.

Nevertheless Josiah would not turn his face from him, but disguised himself, that he might fight with him, and hearkened not unto the words of Neco, from the mouth of God, and came to fight in the valley of Megiddo. And the archers shot at king Josiah; and the king said to his servants, Have me away; for I am sore wounded. So his servants took him out of the chariot, and put him in the second chariot that he had, and brought him to Jerusalem; and he died, and was buried in the sepulchres of his fathers. And all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah. And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah: and all the singing men and singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations, unto this day; and they made them an ordinance in Israel: and, behold, they are written in the lamentations.

Now the rest of the acts of Josiah, and his good deeds, according to that which is written in the law of the Lord, and his acts, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah.

Then the people of the land took Jehoahaz the son of Josiah, and made him king in his father's stead in Jerusalem. Joahaz was twenty and three years old when he began to reign; and he reigned three months in Jerusalem. And the king of Egypt deposed him at Jerusalem, and amerced the land in an hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold. And the king of Egypt made Eliakim his brother king over Judah and Jerusalem, and changed his name to Jehoiakim. And Neco took Joahaz his brother, and carried him to Egypt.

39 Five and twenty years old was Joakim when he began to reign in Judæa and Jerusalem; and he did that which was evil in the sight of the
40 Lord. And against him Nabuchodonosor the king of Babylon came up, and bound him with a chain of brass, and carried him unto Babylon.
41 Nabuchodonosor also took of the holy vessels of the Lord, and carried them away, and set them up in his own temple at Babylon.

42 But those things that are reported of him, and of his uncleanness and impiety, are written in the chronicles of the kings.

43 And Joakim his son reigned in his stead: for when he was made king he was eighteen years
44 old; and he reigned three months and ten days in Jerusalem; and did that which was evil before the Lord.

45 So after a year Nabuchodonosor sent and caused him to be brought unto Babylon with
46 the holy vessels of the Lord; and made Sedekias king of Judæa and Jerusalem,

when he was one
and twenty years old; and he reigned eleven
47 years; and he also did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, and cared not for the words that were spoken by Jeremy the prophet
48 from the mouth of the Lord. And after that king Nabuchodonosor had made him to swear by the name of the Lord, he forswore himself, and rebelled; and hardening his neck, and his heart, he transgressed the laws of the Lord, the
49 God of Israel. Moreover the governors of the people and of the priests did many things wickedly, and passed all the pollutions of all nations, and defiled the temple of the Lord,
50 which was sanctified in Jerusalem. And the God of their fathers sent by his messenger to call them back, because he had compassion on them and on his dwelling place.

51 But they mocked his messengers; and in the day when the Lord spake *unto them*, they scoffed at his prophets:

52 so far forth, that he, being wroth with his people for their great ungodliness, commanded to bring up the kings of the Chaldeans
53 against them; who slew their young men with the sword, round about their holy temple, and

Jehoiakim was twenty and five years old when
5 he began to reign; and he reigned eleven years in Jerusalem: and he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord his God. Against him came
6 up Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and bound him in fetters, to carry him to Babylon.

Nebuchad-
7 nezzar also carried of the vessels of the house of the Lord to Babylon, and put them in his temple at Babylon. Now the rest of the acts of Jehoi-
8 akim, and his abominations which he did, and that which was found in him, behold, they are written in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah: and Jehoiachin his son reigned in his
stead.

Jehoiachin was eight years old when he began
9 to reign; and he reigned three months and ten days in Jerusalem: and he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord.

And at the return
10 of the year king Nebuchadnezzar sent, and brought him to Babylon, with the goodly vessels of the house of the Lord, and made Zedekiah his brother king over Judah and Jerusalem.

Zedekiah was twenty and one years old when
11 he began to reign; and he reigned eleven years in Jerusalem: and he did that which was evil in the
12 sight of the Lord his God; he humbled not himself before Jeremiah the prophet *speaking* from the mouth of the Lord. And he also rebelled
13 against king Nebuchadnezzar, who had made him swear by God: but he stiffened his neck, and hardened his heart from turning unto the Lord, the Lord God of Israel.

Moreover all the
14 chiefs of the priests, and the people, trespassed very greatly after all the abominations of the heathen; and they polluted the house of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem. And
15 the Lord, the God of their fathers, sent to them by his messengers, rising up early and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling place: but they mocked the messen-
16 gers of God, and despised his words, and scoffed at his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy. Therefore he brought upon them the king of the
17 Chaldeans, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man or ancient: he gave them all into his hand.

39 seqq. For Joakim's history *E* does not use the fuller *Ch* of Chron. *Jos.* incorporates material from *Jer.* and elaborates the traditions; cf. *Dan.* i. 1 seq. On the text see further Torrey, 89.

43. Joakim, an error for Jehoiachin.

47. eighteen, mg. eight (*Ch*¹ *L*¹ *S*).

49. and passed all, mg. even above all (*Ch*¹).

50. messenger; read the plural, as in *v.* 51. The Jeremian 'rising up early and sending' (השכם ושלוח), cf. *Jer.* xxix. 19, &c.) is wanting.

51. in the day, a misreading, יום for ימים ('despised').

spared neither young man nor maid, old man nor child; but he delivered all into their hands.
 54 And they took all the holy vessels of the Lord, both great and small, with the vessels of the ark of the Lord, and the king's treasures, and
 55 carried them away unto Babylon. And they burnt the house of the Lord, and brake down the walls of Jerusalem, and burnt the towers
 56 thereof with fire: and as for her glorious things, they never ceased till they had brought them all to nought: and the people that were not slain
 57 with the sword he carried unto Babylon: and they were servants unto him and to his children, till the Persians reigned, to fulfil the word of the
 58 Lord by the mouth of Jeremy: Until the land hath enjoyed her sabbaths, the whole time of her desolation shall she keep sabbath, to fulfil three-score and ten years.

2. 1 In the first year of Cyrus king of the Persians, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of
 2 Jeremy might be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of the Persians, and he made proclamation through all his kingdom,
 3 and also by writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of the Persians; The Lord of Israel, the Most High Lord, hath made me king of the

And all the vessels of the house of God, great 18 and small, and the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king, and of his princes; all these he brought to Babylon. And 19 they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof.

And them that had escaped from the 20 sword carried he away to Babylon; and they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia: to fulfil the word of 21 the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths: for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfil three-score and ten years.

EZRA 1

Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, 1 that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus 2 king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord, the God of heaven, given me;

53. child, MT עֶלְמָא (? 'aged', cf. Ar. *wathwath*, 'weak, impotent').

54. the vessels, mg. the arks of the Lord (E^h, S); based upon a confusion of צֶמֶר ('treasure') and חָרָן.

56. Lit. 'and they made an end of spoiling . . .' (ἀνεκείλευον . . . ἀκριβῶσαι); MT כָּל־כֶּלֶב ('all the goodly . . .') treated as כָּל ('made an end of') כָּל־כֶּלֶב.

that were not slain: τοὺς ἑπιλοιποὺς ἀπέγαγεν μετὰ (E^h ἀπό, cf. L^c) ῥωμαίους 'the people that were left he led away with the sword'.

58. The passage (see Jer. xxv. 12, xxix. 10; Lev. xxvi. 34 seq.) is treated as a quotation (cf. comm. on E. ix. 11 seq.); on the statements, see Torrey, 286 n. 2.

The decree of Cyrus and the return under Sheshbazzar, ii. 1-15=2 Chron. xxxvi. 22 seq., E. i.; cf. Jos. *Ant.* xi. 1. (a) The compiler passes over the years of exile, ignores the tradition of the Median empire represented in Daniel, and proceeds to the first year of Cyrus the Persian, the divinely-appointed agent inspired to fulfil the prophecy of Jeremiah (see Jer. xxiv. 6, xxv. 12 seq., xxix. 10-19, xxxiii. 10-13). His decree (to be contrasted with vi. 24 seqq.) has a marked Jewish tinge, as is recognized even by those who accept it as mainly genuine (Ewald, 49; Sellin, *Stud.* 154; Holzhey, 14), and should be compared with those of Darius (E. iv.) and Artaxerxes (viii. 8 seqq.), and with the royal decrees in the 'canonical' and 'apocryphal' Esther; see Torrey, 144 n. 12, 158. The place of Cyrus in Jewish tradition (see Is. xli. 25, xlv. 28, xlv. 1-13) has been idealized; the story of Bel and the Dragon reveals another view of his character. He was not a monotheist, nor did he fulfil all the expectations of the prophecies. On the other hand, the parallels between his 'cylinder Inscription' and Is. xlv. 28-xlv. 4 (see Kittel, *ZATW*, xviii, 149 seqq.) could suggest that the biblical writers had been directly influenced by the inscription of this patron of the Babylonian gods. Tradition is embellished further in Jos., who refers to a prophecy of Jeremiah heralding the rebuilding of the Temple (x. 7, 3, xi. 11-2; cf. on v. 61), and attributes the enthusiasm of Cyrus to his perusal of the prophecies of Isaiah (cf. similarly Alexander the Great and Daniel, xi. 8, 5, § 337).

(b) The section E. i.-vi. is mainly from the chronicler (Driver, *Lit.* 54; seq.), and while Chron. itself can be controlled by the parallel portions of Samuel and Kings, the criticism of this section rests upon internal data and the independent testimony of Haggai and Zech. i.-viii. From a study of these prophecies it is urged that the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem was first begun in the reign of Darius, and not Cyrus (as in E. iii.), that the builders were the 'remnant' of Judah, no considerable body of exiles having as yet returned (as in E. i. seq., E. iv.-v. 6), that no serious Samaritan hostility had as yet arisen, and that no separation from the heathen of the land had as yet led to the inauguration of a Jewish 'congregation' or 'church'. See, in the first instance, Schrader, 460-504, and for fuller details *Introd.* § 4 (II).

On the text of ii. 1-15 see the comment, Moulton, *ZATW*, xix. 243 seqq., and Torrey, 120 seqq.

II. 3. Most High, MT 'God of Heaven', so also in vi. 31, viii. 19, 21. Definite conclusions can with difficulty be drawn from the numerous and often noteworthy variations in the form of the Divine name; for a summary of the data see Moulton, *ZATW*, xix. 226 seqq. The title 'Most High' (Ὠψίστος = עֶלְיוֹן) recurs frequently in Daniel (14 times), Psalms (21), Eccles. (48), and in Jubilees; more rarely in the Pentateuch (6); see the details in R. H. Charles, *Jubilees*, pp. lvi, 213, who observes that it was most used in the second cent. B.C. On the Greek title see E. Schürer, *Theolog. Lit.-zeit.*, 1897, nos. 9 and (with a review of F. Cumont's *Hypsisistos*) 19; J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 270 seq.

4 whole world, and commanded me to build him
5 a house at Jerusalem that is in Judæa. If there-
fore there be any of you that are of his people,
let the Lord, even his Lord, be with him, and
let him go up to Jerusalem that is in Judæa, and
build the house of the Lord of Israel: he is the
6 Lord that dwelleth in Jerusalem. Of such there-
fore as dwell in divers places, let them that are
7 in his own place help each one with gold, and
with silver, with gifts, with horses also and cattle,
beside the other things which have been added
by vow for the temple of the Lord which is in
Jerusalem.
8 Then the chief of the families of Judah and of
the tribe of Benjamin stood up; the priests also,
and the Levites, and all they whose spirit the
Lord had stirred to go up, to build the house for
the Lord which is in Jerusalem.
9 And they that
dwelt round about them helped them in all things
with silver and gold, with horses and cattle, and
with very many gifts that were vowed of a great
number whose minds were stirred up *thereto*.
10 King Cyrus also brought forth the holy vessels
of the Lord, which Nabuchodonosor had carried
away from Jerusalem, and had set up in his temple
11 of idols. Now when Cyrus king of the Persians
had brought them forth, he delivered them to
12 Mithradates his treasurer, and by him they were
delivered to Sanabassar the governor of Judæa.
13 And this was the number of them: A thousand
golden cups, a thousand cups of silver, censers of
silver twenty nine, vials of gold thirty, and of
silver two thousand four hundred and ten, and
14 other vessels a thousand. So all the vessels of
gold and of silver were brought up, even five

and he hath charged me to build him an house
in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whosoever 3
there is among you of all his people, his God
be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem,
which is in Judah, and build the house of the
Lord, the God of Israel, (he is God,) which is in
Jerusalem. And whosoever is left, in any place 4
where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help
him with silver, and with gold, and with goods,
and with beasts, beside the freewill offering for
the house of God which is in Jerusalem.

Then 5
rose up the heads of fathers' houses of Judah and
Benjamin, and the priests, and the Levites, even
all whose spirit God had stirred to go up to build
the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem.
And all they that were round about them 6
strengthened their hands with vessels of silver,
with gold, with goods, and with beasts, and with
precious things, beside all that was willingly
offered.

Also Cyrus the king brought forth the 7
vessels of the house of the Lord, which Nebu-
chadnezzar had brought forth out of Jerusalem,
and had put them in the house of his gods; even 8
those did Cyrus king of Persia bring forth by the
hand of Mithredath the treasurer, and numbered
them unto Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah.
And this is the number of them: thirty chargers 9
of gold, a thousand chargers of silver, nine and
twenty knives; thirty bowls of gold, silver bowls 10
of a second sort four hundred and ten, and other
vessels a thousand. All the vessels of gold and 11
of silver were five thousand and four hundred.

5. **people.** עֲלֵי 'who desireth to go up': cf. v. 8, viii. 10 seq.
let the Lord, mg. *let his Lord be, &c.* (עֲלֵי), cf. Chron. *Yahweh his God*.
the Lord that dwelleth, cf. E R.V. mg.: *he is the God which . . .* (with omission of the brackets).
7. **horses,** reading עֲלֵי for עֲלֵי (cf. v. 9); perhaps wrongly, see Torrey, 121.
added by vow (or 'in accordance with vow'), cf. v. 9, viii. 13, and see *ZATW*, xix. 231.
9. **in all things,** בכל, for MT בְּכָל.
of a great number, reading עֲלֵי (i.e. 'with precious things in abundance') in place of the incorrect עֲלֵי ('beside').
10. **holy vessels.** For the rendering cf. i. 45, vi. 18, 26; Dan. i. 2 (MS. 87) and Moulton, *ZATW*, xix. 228 seq.
There is an obvious effort to link the new Temple with that of Solomon (cf. similarly the Register of the exiles in v. 1-46), but the details are intricate. Some of the Temple-vessels were removed in the reign of Jehoiakim (2 Chron. xxxvi. 7, Dan. i. 2; wanting in 2 Kings). Later, in the time of Jehoiachin all were cut up or carried away (2 Kings xxiv. 13 seq., a doubtful passage, see the comm.). In Zedekiah's time, nevertheless, many evidently were left (Jer. xxvii. 16 seqq., xxviii. 3), and a prophecy of their removal also promises their restoration, although this latter feature is absent from E's text (xxvii. 16-22). Finally, at the fall of Jerusalem they were broken up and removed (2 Kings xxv. 13-17, Jer. lii. 17 seqq.). (The evidence in Judith iv. 1-3 for a return of exiles and vessels in the time of Nebuchadnezzar and the high-priest Joakim can hardly be discussed.) The sacrilegious use of the vessels by Belshazzar was avenged by the division of the Babylonian empire among the Medes and Persians, and Darius became king (Dan. v.). The tradition of their restoration in the reign of Cyrus clearly conflicts with E iv. 44, 57, where Darius effects what Cyrus had been unable to accomplish, and this belief can hardly have been current among those who knew of their return as described in E i. Moreover, the prophets Hag. and Zech. (time of Darius) do not imply that the vessels had been restored; E received rich supplies (E viii. 17), and returned with gifts something over £2,500,000 in value (Meyer, 69 seq.). But in the story of N the Temple appears to be neglected and poor, and Is. lx. 5-7 look forward to wealthy gifts. Another aspect is presented when it is supposed that the Temple-furniture had been concealed (see 2 Macc. ii. 4-8; *Apoc. Baruch*, ed. Charles, vi. 7 seqq., lxxx. 2, and p. 168).
12. **Sanabassar** (עֲלֵי), mg. *Sananassar* (עֲלֵי in v. 14, but 'Sanamassar' here). On the numerous variant forms see Guthe (*SBO7*) and Torrey, 136 seq. See below, vi. 18.
13 seq. On the variations in this passage see Torrey, 123 seq., 138 seq.

15 thousand four hundred threescore and nine, and were carried back by Sanabassar, together with them of the captivity, from Babylon to Jerusalem.

16 But in the time of Artaxerxes king of the Persians Belemus, and Mithradates, and Tabellius, and Rathumus, and Beeltethmus, and Samellius the scribe, with the others that were in commission with them, dwelling in Samaria and other places, wrote unto him against them that dwell in Judæa and Jerusalem the letter following: To king Artaxerxes our Lord, Thy servants, Rathumus the storywriter, and Samellius the scribe, and the rest of their council, and the judges that are in Cœlesyria and Phœnicia.

18 Be it now known to our lord the king, that the Jews that are come up from you to us, being come unto

All these did Sheshbazzar bring up, when they of the captivity were brought up from Babylon unto Jerusalem.

And in the reign of Ahasuerus, in the beginning of his reign, wrote they an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem.

And in the days of Artaxerxes wrote Bishlam, 7 Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of his companions, unto Artaxerxes king of Persia; and the writing of the letter was written in the Syrian character, and set forth in the Syrian tongue. Rehum the 8 chancellor and Shimshai the scribe wrote a letter against Jerusalem to Artaxerxes the king in this sort: then wrote Rehum the chancellor, and Shimshai the scribe, and the rest of their companions; the Dinaites, and the Apharsathchites, the Tarpelites, the Apharsites, the Archevites, the Babylonians, the Shushanchites, the Dehaites, the Elamites, and the rest of the nations whom the 10 great and noble Osnappar brought over, and set in the city of Samaria, and in the rest of the country beyond the river, and so forth. This is 11 the copy of the letter that they sent unto Artaxerxes the king; Thy servants the men beyond the river, and so forth. Be it known unto the 12 king, that the Jews which came up from thee are come to us unto Jerusalem; they are building

15. Neither MT nor the explicit *E* supports the conjecture (Meyer, 193; cf. Hölzhey, 15 seq., Davies, 47) that Sheshbazzar returned to prepare the way for Zerubbabel.

The opposition in the reign of Artaxerxes, ii. 16-30 = E iv. 7-24 (Aramaic), cf. Jos. *Ant.* xi. 2 1-2.

(a) This passage cannot, in either E or *E*, come between the reigns of Cyrus and Darius. There is an obvious gap after v. 15, and Jos., who ingeniously changes Artaxerxes into Cambyses, avoids it by an introduction (§ 19 seq., to be compared with § 88 = *E* v. 72 seq.), and ends with the statement of a delay of nine years (including 6 of Cambyses, 2 of Darius). The passage has hardly 'strayed' to its place in *E* (Davies, 84); it is not indispensable in *E*, whereas in *E* it is a necessary link between the return of Sheshbazzar and the tradition in iii. seq. Various attempts have been made to show that it is in its true position before the accession of Darius, whether by identifying the latter with D. II, or, like Josephus, by treating Artaxerxes as a mistake for Cambyses (cf. Sellin, Winckler, Torrey, and see references by Howorth in *PSBA*, xxiii. 313, 319, and Jampel, i. 103 seq., ii. 97 seq.). These only cut the knot. Allowance must be made for a compilation based on a particular though erroneous theory of the Median and Persian kings (see Torrey, 38, 286, 302), but the real difficulty is the occurrence of this document relating to the time of Artaxerxes immediately after the reign of Cyrus. On its place, see further below, p. 56, and *Introd.* § 5 (b).

(b) The text in *E* is certainly from an Aramaic original. Note the translation of בעל כותב 'story-writer' (mg. 'recorder') in 17, 25, but the transliteration in 16 and (with a doublet) 25; the different renderings in E⁵ (e.g. εἰρηνη for MT Bishlam, *E* Belemus, v. 16); and such variant renderings as 'cities' (v. 22 for 'provinces'), 'passage' (v. 24 and Jos. § 25; חלק for MT חלק 'portion'). *E*, although free and paraphrastic, preserves (as noticed by Volz, 1490) some better readings: 'our lord, the king' (v. 17 seq., 21, cf. vi. 8; in agreement with Aramaic diplomatic usage), 'be it now known' (v. 18, see Torrey, 146, 186; *E*⁵ prefixes 'peace'); 'books' (v. 21), 'the Jews' (v. 23). Sometimes, however, decision is difficult; so in v. 25 seq., 28, the references to the Temple in v. 18, 20, and especially the introduction compared with E iv. 6-11. In the MT 7 and 8 imply *lxx* letters, but the relationship is not clear; both 8 b and 10 b (ending 'and now' as in v. 11) point to the immediate commencement of a letter. The (Hebrew) reference to Ahasuerus (Xerxes) in v. 6 (cf. the story of Esther) is wanting in *E*, although v. 16 (end) seems to represent MT 6 b, and v. 17 covers MT v. 8 (end), 9 (omitting the names after 'Dinaites', *E* 'judges'), and 10 (the reference to 'beyond the river'). Thus *E* v. 18 begins the letter and corresponds to MT 12 (cf. 11 b with 10 b). The intricacies may be due partly to the compiler's effort to quote a source and also to use it in his narrative (cf. on *E* vi. below), partly also to the revision of *E* after E and the reverse. It is noteworthy that E (where i.-iv. 6 is in Hebrew) takes care to state that the document was in Aramaic and needed translating (v. 7 and 18 R.V. mg.); this is ignored in *E*, as also is the debatable טרשׁ in *E* ix. 48. See further the comment. and Torrey, 172 seq., 178 seq., Bayer, 33 seq.

17. *Cœlesyria and Phœnicia*. The geographical term in MT ('Transflumen', 'Transpotamia') represents the Persian province west of the Euphrates, and to this the earlier use of the term Cœlesyria (before the first cent. B.C.) corresponds. *E*'s rendering (contrast E⁵'s literal πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ) may point to an Egyptian locale where the geography of Palestine and Syria was unfamiliar (Torrey, 83). Jos. names Syria and Phœnicia, and adds Ammon and Moab; cf. perhaps Tobiah the Ammonite and Sanballat (if a native of Horonaim).

Jerusalem, do build that rebellious and wicked city, and do repair the marketplaces and the walls of it, and do lay the foundation of a temple.

19 Now if this city be builded and the walls thereof be finished, they will not only refuse to give tribute, but will even stand up against kings.

20 And forasmuch as the things pertaining to the temple are now in hand, we think it meet not to neglect such a matter, but to speak unto our lord the king, to the intent that, if it be thy pleasure, search may be made in the books of thy fathers:

21 and thou shalt find in the chronicles what is written concerning these things, and shalt understand that that city was rebellious, troubling both kings and cities: and that the Jews were rebellious, and raised always wars therein of old time; for the which cause even this city was laid waste.

24 Wherefore now we do declare unto thee, O lord the king, that if this city be builded again, and the walls thereof set up anew, thou shalt from henceforth have no passage into Coelesyria and Phoenicia. Then the king wrote back again to Rathumus the storywriter, and Beletethmus, and Samellius the scribe, and to the rest that were in commission, and dwelt in Samaria and Syria and Phoenicia, after this manner: I have read the epistle which ye have sent unto me:

I commanded to make search, and it hath been found that that city of old time hath made insurrection against kings; and the men were given to rebellion and war therein: and that mighty kings and fierce were in Jerusalem, who reigned and exacted tribute in Coelesyria and Phoenicia. Now therefore I have commanded to hinder those men from building the city,

and heed to be taken that there be nothing done contrary to this order; and that those wicked doings proceed no further to the annoyance of kings. Then king Artaxerxes his letters being read, Rathumus, and Samellius the scribe, and the rest that were in commission with them, removing in haste unto Jerusalem with horsemen and a multitude of people in battle array, began to hinder the builders; and the building of the temple in Jeru-

the rebellious and the bad city, and have finished the walls, and repaired the foundations.

Be it known now unto the king, that, if this city be builded, and the walls finished, they will not pay tribute, custom, or toll, and in the end it will endamage the kings. Now because we eat the salt of the palace, and it is not meet for us to see the king's dishonour, therefore have we sent and certified the king; that search may be made in the book of the records of thy fathers: so shalt thou find in the book of the records, and know that this city is a rebellious city, and hurtful unto kings and provinces, and that they have moved sedition within the same of old time: for which cause was this city laid waste.

We certify the king that, if this city be builded, and the walls finished, by this means thou shalt have no portion beyond the river.

Then sent the king an answer unto Rehum the chancellor, and to Shimshai the scribe, and to the rest of their companions that dwell in Samaria, and in the rest of the country beyond the river, Peace, and so forth. The letter which ye sent unto us hath been plainly read before me. And I decreed, and search hath been made, and it is found that this city of old time hath made insurrection against kings, and that rebellion and sedition have been made therein. There have been mighty kings also over Jerusalem, which have ruled over all the country beyond the river; and tribute, custom, and toll, was paid unto them. Make ye now a decree to cause these men to cease, and that this city be not builded, until a decree shall be made by me. And take heed that ye be not slack herein: why should damage grow to the hurt of the kings?

Then when the copy of king Artaxerxes' letter was read before Rehum, and Shimshai the scribe, and their companions, they went in haste to Jerusalem unto the Jews, and made them to cease by force and power.

Then ceased the work of

18. lay the foundation . . . , *kai taion upoballontai* (BA; *uperbállontai themelióntai*, L).

20. temple . . . in hand (*energeitai ta kata ton naon*), lit. 'are being urged on'. MT *Now because . . . palace* (ὁ οἶκος) may mean that the writers are in the king's service, or have entered into a covenant with him, or (reading 'our salt is the . . .'; Nestle, Strack) receive the dues of the palace or temple (cf. E vii. 22, 1 Macc. x. 29, xi. 35).

E apparently rests upon some confusion of מלח ('salt'), with מלאכה ('work of'), מלח ('the matter of'), or perhaps מלא ('be full, complete'). In any case the reference to the Temple here and in v. 18 is noteworthy; either it may be part of a deliberate aim to introduce allusions to the Temple (see Bayer, 87 seqq., 94 seq., 102), or there was a tradition of the building of the Temple in the time of Artaxerxes. The latter finds independent support (see *Introd.* § 5 *et*), and the text in MT may be explained by the fact that, while in *E* and E Sheshbazzar had returned to rebuild the Temple, in *E* only is there an account of the commencement of the work and the delay. See also *Introd.* 15 seq.

23. Rather 'rebellious and still continuing sieges therein from of old' (Ball).

30. horsemen, &c.; MT *force* (lit. 'arm') and *power* (lit. 'strength' or 'army'). Cf. the situation in N iv. 2, 8.

salem ceased until the second year of the reign of Darius king of the Persians.

the house of God which is at Jerusalem; and it ceased unto the second year of the reign of Darius king of Persia.

- 3** ¹ Now king Darius made a great feast unto all his subjects, and unto all that were born in his house, ² and unto all the princes of Media and of Persia, and to all the satraps and captains and governors ³ that were under him, from India unto Ethiopia, in the hundred twenty and seven provinces. And when they had eaten and drunken, and being satisfied were gone home, then Darius the king went into his bedchamber, and slept, and awaked out of his sleep.
- ⁴ Then the three young men of the body-guard, that kept the king's person, spake one to another: ⁵ Let every one of us say one thing which shall be strongest: and he whose sentence shall seem wisest than the others, unto him shall Darius the king give great gifts, and great honours in token of

The Story of the Three Pages and the Decree of Darius, iii. 1-v. 6, wanting in E; see Jos. xi. 3 2-6.

(a) This section, famous for the Praise of Truth and for the familiar though often misquoted saying in iv. 41, is the centre of the problems of *E*. The story, well-known to early Christian Fathers and Synoptists, appears to be a piece of popular literature (cf. Susanna, Bel and the Dragon), not originally connected with Zerubbabel (see iv. 13, v. 5). Although ascribed to the early part of the reign of Darius (iv. 43, v. 6), it was evidently not written for the present context, which, indeed, it throws into great chronological confusion (see iv. 44, 57; v. 2, 55, 71, 73). In fact, the name Apame (iv. 29) suggests the time of Darius III (Codomannus), and the original scene, not laid in Babylon (iv. 57, 61), though ostensibly in Susa, was probably Egypt (so most scholars) or Antioch in Syria (Marq. 66). The orations are not distinctively biblical. That on drink stands in contrast, e.g. to Prov. xiii. 29-35, Eccles. xxxi. 25-30; and iv. 20 and 39 do not necessarily indicate any acquaintance with Gen. ii. 24 and Deut. x. 17 respectively. Allusions to Samson (so Lupton) are not obvious in iv. 17, 24, 26. The religious colouring is weak, but has been deepened by translators (see iv. 35 seq., 41, 59). Even the fine Praise of Truth seems to be an early addition: it is loosely appended to the paean of women, which, again, is out of touch with O.T. thought. Yet, even though the story be somewhat removed from biblical ideas, it may still be Jewish. The Praise of Truth, for example, may be a specimen of Palestinian wisdom (Zunz), and although Volz (1493) thinks it shows contact with Alexandrian religious philosophy, Torrey (46 seq.) fails to find anything 'hellenistic' or suggestive of the influence of Greek literature or philosophy.

(b) Ewald has suggested a connexion with the Sibylline books (iii. 293 seq.), where allusion is made to Persian kings inspired by *dreams* to further the restoration of the Temple. This is as little convincing or helpful as the alleged parallel between the questions debated by the Three Pages and the propositions put to the Jewish elders in the Letter of Aristeas. On the other hand, the opening of the story is clearly reminiscent of Est. i. 1-3; iii. 9 seems to be connected with Dan. vi. 2 (Torrey, 48), and several other interesting points of contact with Esther and Daniel have been noticed by Bayer (110 seqq.). Lagarde (*Mittheil.* iv. 358) conjectured that the story once followed after Dan. vi. 1. It is not improbable that the compiler identified Darius with the Mede in Dan. v. 31 (Hitzig, Reuss), and Büchler (51) further points out that Daniel's prayer in the first year of Darius (ix.) knows of no earlier return of exiles and may be associated with *E*'s story of Zerubbabel, which is placed in the king's second year. The story contains data which ignore and exclude *E* ii. 1-15 (note that Cyrus follows Darius in the book of Daniel). The land is waste and is partly occupied by Edomites who had burned the Temple. Neither exiles nor Temple-vessels had as yet returned, and now for the first time the favour of Persia had been gained and permission was given to return. For some reason Cyrus had been unable to fulfil his vow, and that of Darius is virtually a duplicate. It is, as Ewald (129) trenchantly observes, 'as if these kings had been in the habit of thinking of the God of Israel and the fate of his people at every critical moment of their lives, and the history of the whole world had strictly hinged in consequence upon the changes of its lot'. Ewald, however, accepts the decree of Cyrus, and this leaves no room for that of Darius, which is as credible, in itself, as that of the other Persian kings. See below, p. 32.

(c) It is very generally agreed that, with the exception of v. 1-6, the section was probably or certainly composed in Greek. But signs of a Hebrew original have been noticed by Schrader, Renan, Ball, and especially Jahn, who offers a Hebrew retranslation (177-88). Torrey (20-25, 57-61) argues for a Hebrew or Aramaic original, on the grounds of internal linguistic features, antecedent probability (viz. the close connexion between v. 1-6 and the end of iv.), and the characteristic interest in the ecclesiastical bodies (iv. 51-56). He notices several 'Aramaisms' (e.g. use of *רָצוּ*, Aram. אָרַץ; *הָרָצוּ*, אָרַץ), and concludes that the Story of the Three Pages was in Aramaic, and metrical (p. 47); *צוּ*, 43-46 were also in Aramaic, but the sequel in Hebrew (pp. 29 seq., 58). Bayer (123 seqq.) agrees, but urges that the whole of iii. and iv. was in Aramaic. See further Torrey's retranslation and notes (50 seqq.), and below on iv. 42 seqq. Jos. reproduces the section, with a necessary introduction to account for the presence of Zerubbabel; he seems to have used a slightly different version (Büchler, 57 seqq., 100; see on iii. 3). An abbreviated version is given in the Latin summary published by Lagarde (*Sept. Stud.* ii. 16 seqq.; here cited as Lag.), and in Josippon (see Büchler, 59 seqq., 62 seq., 100 seq.). For other witnesses see on iv. 36, 41, 59.

III. 3. **slept, and awaked**: *ἐκοιμήθη καὶ ἔξηννος ἐγένετο*, 'lay down and was sleepless'; cf. *ἔξηννος* in mod. Greek 'wide-awake' (J. C. Lawson, *Mod. Gr. Folklore*, p. 31). According to Jos. § 35, cf. § 57, the king was restless (cf. Est. vi. 1), and was the first to suggest the orations and to promise and specify rewards. This conflicts with *v.* 8 seq., but seems to be hinted at in iv. 42 (*πλείω τῶν γεγραμμένων*). On the other hand, *E* does not allow that the suggestion came from the king, who is asleep (*αὐτ.* 8 seq., 13). Jahn proposes to read *ἐνυπνος* (p. 177); Torrey (24, 50) conjectures that the original Aramaic text read: '(v. 3) . . . Darius . . . slept. (v. 4) Then stood on the watch (or "bestirred themselves" מַתְעֲרֵן הוּ) three young guardsmen (who protected the person of the king: a gloss), and they said . . .'

5. **thing** (*λόγον*), i.e. sentence, as in *v.* 16.

strongest (*ὑπερισχίστου*), i.e. shall prevail.

sentence (*ῥήμα*), i.e. argument.

honours, &c., *ἐπιτίκια μεγάλα*, (v. 6) *καὶ πορφύραν περιβαλίσθαι*; Jos. § 35 *νικητήριον πορφύραν ἐνδύσασθαι*. Cf. Dan. v. 7.

6 victory: as, to be clothed in purple, to drink in gold, and to sleep upon gold, and a chariot with
7 brides of gold, and a headtire of fine linen, and a chain about his neck: and he shall sit next to
8 Darius because of his wisdom, and shall be called Darius his cousin. And then they wrote every
9 one his sentence, and set to their seals, and laid *the writing* under king Darius his pillow, and said,
When the king is risen, some shall give him the writing; and of whose side the king and the three
princes of Persia shall judge that his sentence is the wisest, to him shall the victory be given, as it is
10, 11, 12 written. The first wrote, Wine is the strongest. The second wrote, The king is strongest. The
third wrote, Women are strongest: but above all things Truth beareth away the victory.

13 Now when the king was risen up, they took the writing, and gave it unto him, and so he read it:
14 and sending forth he called all the princes of Persia and of Media, and the satraps, and the captains,
15 and the governors, and the chief officers; and sat him down in the royal seat of judgement; and the
16 writing was read before them. And he said, Call the young men, and they shall explain their own
17 sentences. So they were called, and came in. And they said unto them, Declare unto us your
mind concerning the things ye have written.

18 Then began the first, who had spoken of the strength of wine, and said thus, O sirs, how exceeding
19 strong is wine! it causeth all men to err that drink it: it maketh the mind of the king and of the
fatherless child to be all one; of the bondman and of the freeman, of the poor man and of the rich:
20 it turneth also every thought into jollity and mirth, so that a man remembereth neither sorrow nor
21 debt: and it maketh every heart rich, so that a man remembereth neither king nor satrap; and it
22 maketh to speak all things by talents: and when they are in their cups, they forget their love both
23 to friends and brethren, and a little after draw their swords: but when they awake from their wine,
24 they remember not what they have done. O sirs, is not wine the strongest, seeing that it enforceth
to do thus? And when he had so spoken, he held his peace.

4 1, 2 Then the second, that had spoken of the strength of the king, began to say, O sirs, do not men
; excel in strength, that bear rule over the sea and land, and all things in them? But yet is the king
stronger: and he is their lord, and hath dominion over them; and in whatsoever he commandeth
4 them they obey him. If he bid them make war the one against the other, they do it: and if he
5 send them out against the enemies, they go, and overcome mountains, walls, and towers. They
slay and are slain, and transgress not the king's commandment: if they get the victory, they bring
6 all to the king, as well the spoil, as all things else. Likewise for those that are no soldiers, and
have not to do with wars, but use husbandry, when they have reaped again that which they had sown,
7 they bring it to the king, and compel one another to pay tribute unto the king. And he is but one
8 man: if he command to kill, they kill; if he command to spare, they spare; if he command to
smite, they smite; if he command to make desolate, they make desolate; if he command to build,
9, 10 they build; if he command to cut down, they cut down; if he command to plant, they plant. So
all his people and his armies obey him: furthermore he lieth down, he eateth and drinketh, and

9. some (i.e. they) shall give, δώσωσαν. \mathfrak{L} dabimus.
three princes, cf. Est. i. 14 (\mathfrak{C} , but MT 7, as in *E* viii. 11).
as it is written, Jahn restores according to his writing.
12. above all things . . . (ὑπὲρ δὲ πάντα . . .), i.e. 'Truth is victor over all' (Torrey, p. 24, cf. נצח על). 'The
third appears to have a double thesis to maintain, thus interfering with the symmetry' (Lupton).
13. \mathfrak{C}^1 'writings', and similarly in v. 15.
14. \mathfrak{C}^1 om. *satraps*. Cf. Dan. iii. 2 for this list.
15. *sat*; \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{S} they sat.
seat of judgement (χρηματιστηριον), council-chamber (cf. A.V. mg.).
16. he, \mathfrak{C}^1 \mathfrak{S} they.
17. they said, \mathfrak{L} he said, \mathfrak{C}^1 \mathfrak{L}^c and the king said.
18. \mathfrak{L} quam (+ facile \mathfrak{L}^c ; cito Lag.) *praeuilet* (\mathfrak{L}^c vincit) *vinum omnibus hominibus* (\mathfrak{L}^c omnes homines) *qui bibunt*
illud.
21. speak . . . by talents, \mathfrak{C}^1 + καὶ πάντα διὰ γραμμάτων ποιεῖ ὅταν δὲ πίωσι.
23. awake, \mathfrak{C}^1 ἐγερθῶσιν, \mathfrak{C}^2 γερθῶσιν, \mathfrak{C}^3 γέωνται, \mathfrak{L}^c et cum digesserit vinum et surrexerint (Lag. cum a vino
fuerint . . .).
24. \mathfrak{C}^1 how is not wine . . . cf. iv. 12, 32.
IV. 2. that bear . . . rather 'in bearing rule . . .'
3. their lord, \mathfrak{C}^1 lord of all, cf. A.V.; \mathfrak{L} rex autem super omnia praecellit, \mathfrak{L}^c . . . super fortis est.
and hath . . . them, \mathfrak{C}^1 om.
obey, \mathfrak{C}^1 \mathfrak{S} ἐπακούουσιν, \mathfrak{C}^2 αὐτὸς ἀκούουσι τοῦ ἐνός, \mathfrak{C}^3 ποιήσουσιν (cf. L Lag. faciunt); \mathfrak{L}^c om. 'and in . . . him'.
5. as well the spoil . . . \mathfrak{C}^1 καὶ (A + ὅσα) ἐὰν προσημεύσωσιν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα (i.e. 'and if they raid—and all else' [in
like manner]), \mathfrak{L} they bring to the king whatsoever they spoil. Torrey (52) conjectures a confusion of Aram. אָחַר 'take'
and אָחַר 'other'.
7. but one man, mg. one and alone; \mathfrak{C}^1 καὶ αὐτὸς εἰ (\mathfrak{C}^2 \mathfrak{S}^{ab} εἰς) μόνος ἐστίν, cf. Josh. xxii. 20, Judith i. 11 (so Torrey,
52. who would join the words to v. 6).
8. \mathfrak{C} om. if in v. 8 seq. \mathfrak{C}^1 om. εἶπεν ἐρηώσας ἐρημώσιν. Cf. generally Dan. v. 19.

I ESDRAS 4. 11-35

11 taketh his rest : and these keep watch round about him, neither may any one depart, and do his own
 12 business, neither disobey they him *in anything*. O sirs, how should not the king be strongest, seeing
 that in such sort he is obeyed? And he held his peace.
 13 Then the third, who had spoken of women, and of truth, (this was Zorobabel) began to speak.
 14 O sirs, is not the king great, and men are many, and wine is strong? who is it then that ruleth them,
 15 or hath the lordship over them? are they not women? Women have borne the king and all the
 16 people that bear rule by sea and land. Even of them came they: and they nourished them up that
 17 planted the vineyards, from whence the wine cometh. These also make garments for men; these
 18 bring glory unto men; and without women cannot men be. Yea, and if men have gathered together
 gold and silver and every other goodly thing, and see a woman which is comely in favour and beauty,
 19 they let all those things go, and gape after her, and even with open mouth fix their eyes fast on her;
 20 and have all more desire unto her than unto gold or silver, or any goodly thing whatsoever. A man
 21 leaveth his own father that brought him up, and his own country, and cleaveth unto his wife. And
 22 with his wife he endeth his days, and remembereth neither father, nor mother, nor country. By this
 also ye must know that women have dominion over you: do ye not labour and toil, and give and
 23 bring all to women? Yea, a man taketh his sword, and goeth forth to make outroads, and to rob
 24 and to steal, and to sail upon the sea and upon rivers; and looketh upon a lion, and walketh in the
 25 darkness; and when he hath stolen, spoiled, and robbed, he bringeth it to his love. Wherefore a man
 26 loveth his wife better than father or mother. Yea, many there be that have run out of their wits for
 27 women, and become bondmen for their sakes. Many also have perished, have stumbled, and sinned,
 28 for women. And now do ye not believe me? is not the king great in his power? do not all regions
 29 fear to touch him? Yet did I see him and Apame the king's concubine, the daughter of the illus-
 30 trious Bartacus, sitting at the right hand of the king, and taking the crown from the king's head,
 31 and setting it upon her own head; yea, she struck the king with her left hand: and therewithal the
 king gaped and gazed upon her with open mouth: if she laughed upon him, he laughed also: but
 if she took any displeasure at him, he was fain to flatter, that she might be reconciled to him again.
 32 O sirs, how can it be but women should be strong, seeing they do thus?
 33 Then the king and the nobles looked one upon another: so he began to speak concerning truth.
 34 O sirs, are not women strong? great is the earth, high is the heaven, swift is the sun in his course,
 for he compasseth the heavens round about, and fetcheth his course again to his own place in one
 35 day. Is he not great that maketh these things? therefore great is truth, and stronger than all

13. οὗτος ἐστὶν Ζορ., G¹ L^c S + the son of Salathiel, Lag. + of the house of David, of the tribe of Judah, cf. v. 5. The identity of the unknown third youth (note v. 58), thus parenthetically introduced, is stated also by G² in v. 61, by L^c in 33, 43, 58, and by Jos. regularly after iv. 40.

14. is not . . . G² by omitting the negative, makes the statement, and joining the verse on to v. 15, reads 'have not women borne the king? and all the people . . . land were even of them'.

men are many, or are mighty, see Torrey, 24, 53.

From v. 14 seq. Büchler (61 seq.) conjectures that the first and second orations have been transposed; cf. August. *de Civ. Dei*, xviii. 36 'quum reges unus dixisset, alter vinum, tertius mulieres,' &c.

17. garments . . . glory, probably a doublet (Torrey).

18. and see . . . G² do they not love (cf. A.V.).

comely . . . beauty καλὴν . . . τῷ κάλλει, an evident sign of translation (Torrey, 53).

21. endeth his days, G² ἀφίηται τὴν ψυχὴν; or 'loseth his life' (Ball, who cfs. Gen. xxxv. 18 G); otherwise ' . . . for the sake of (? misunderstood) his wife' (Jahn, 178), or 'abandoneth himself' (Torrey, 53, cf. S). Jos. § 52 καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀφίηται μετ' αὐτῶν (ἀξιοῦμεν καὶ, see Niese) καρτεροῦμεν.

22. ye must know . . . over you, G² 'we . . . us'.

23. make outroads, G² ἐξοδεύειν (cf. 1 Macc. xv. 41), G² εἰς ἐξοδαί, L^c 'to waylay', S 'to travel'.

and to steal, G² om.

24. looketh upon (i. e. faces or confronts), G² θεωρεῖ, L^c contemnit, Lag. *villit*; Treuenfels conj. θηρεῖ, 'hunts'.

25. Wherefore, lit. 'and', similarly in vv. 35 ('therefore'), 49 ('moreover').

27. stumbled, G² ἐσφάλησαν, G² ἐσφάγησαν (cf. L), S 'erred'.

28. do ye not, G² 'if ye'.

29. I see him and, Torrey, 339 conj. *I myself* (αὐτός) αὐτοῦ . . .

the illustrious Bartacus. G² Βαρτακου (BA; Βαζικου, L; βαζεζικου, Jos.; Bezacis, Bezzachi, Lat.; r-b-'t-t-k S) τοῦ θαυμαστοῦ (θεμασίον Jos., ? a proper name, cf. Θαμάσιος, Herod. vii. 194). The reference may be to no historical person (Bayer, 116), or to Apame daughter of the satrap Artabazos III, or of the Bactrian satrap Spitamenes: the former was given to Ptolemy Lagos, the latter to Seleucus Nicator. Thus the story may relate to Egypt or to Antioch, and date from the time of Darius III, Codomannus (c. 300 B.C.). See further, Marq. 65 seq.; Torrey, 40 seqq., 54, 102; Josippon (Büchler, 66 n. 2) would make Apame the daughter of Axios (?) the Macedonian.

30. struck, G² ἐπάειξε, 'was slapping'.

31. therewithal, G² καὶ πρὸς τούτοις, 'and moreover' (Lupton, cf. v. 10), or, 'and in spite of this' (Torrey, 25, 54).

33. one upon another, G² εἰς [ἐτέρος πρὸς, A] τὸν ἕτερον; G² ἐν τῷ ἐτέρω (see Torrey, 54 g).

35. maketh, rather 'doeth'; the reference is transferred from the Sun to the Deity (see esp. Jos.).

therefore, καὶ, rather 'but'.

36 things. All the earth calleth upon truth, and the heaven blesseth her: all works shake and tremble, 37 but with her is no unrighteous thing. Wine is unrighteous, the king is unrighteous, women are unrighteous, all the children of men are unrighteous, and unrighteous are all such their works; and 38 there is no truth in them; in their unrighteousness also they shall perish. But truth abideth, and 39 is strong for ever; she liveth and conquereth for evermore. With her there is no accepting of persons or rewards; but she doeth the things that are just, and refraineth from all unrighteous and 40 wicked things; and all men do well like of her works. Neither in her judgement is any unrighteousness; and she is the strength, and the kingdom, and the power, and the majesty, of all ages. Blessed 41 be the God of truth. And with that he held his tongue. And all the people then shouted, and said, Great is truth, and strong above all things. 42 Then said the king unto him, Ask what thou wilt more than is appointed in writing, and we will give it thee, inasmuch as thou art found wisest; and thou shalt sit next me, and shalt be called my

36. calleth upon, A.V. mg. *praiseth the truth*, Lag. *invocet*; Athanasius, *Or. II. c. Arion*. ii. xx, quotes the passage ('all . . . tremble'), and argues that if all the earth 'praiseth' (*ἡμῶν*) the Demiurge and Truth, the former is the Logos.

works, *ἔργα*, perhaps originally 'created things' (Torrey), Lag. *quae mouentur tremet*.

with her (so Jos.), but *ἡμῶν* (mg.) is a well attested reading and refers to the Deity as in v. 35 (see Torrey, 55).

37. and there is, Torrey (25) con. 'if (it) there is . . .'
38-40. See Cyprian, *Ep. lxxiv.*, August. *de Civit. Dei*, xviii. ch. 36.

38. for evermore, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*, a Semitism.

39. rewards, *ἔμ' διαφορά* (cf. *L S*), *ἔμ' διαφύρα*; Torrey, 56 a, compares 2 Chron. xix. 7. and refraineth, similarly *ἔμ' L S* Lag.; the text implies a misunderstanding of the comparative particle: 'things that are just rather than all . . .' (Fr., Ball, Torrey, 25, 56).

do well like, *ἰδοκίαι*, cf. Matt. iii. 17.

40. she, *αὐτή*; *ἔμ' αὐτῆς* 'hers'; read perhaps *αὐτῆ* 'to her' (cf. Lag. *ἰψή*). With the doxology cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 11, Dan. ii. 37, Matt. vi. 13.

Blessed . . . or, since Truth is praised, restore 'blessed of God be Truth' (Torrey, 56).

41. *Ἡ Μεγάλη ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡπερισχέως*; *Ἡ magna est veritas et praevalet* (*L^c + omnibus*). There is no good authority for the erroneous *praevaleret*. Jos. ignores the saying. Cyprian (*Ep. lxxiv.* 9) quotes it as *veritas manet et invalescet*. August. (*de Civ. Dei*, xviii. 36) refers to this passage as a prophecy of Christ. See further, for citations, Pohlmann, 263 seq.

The appendix on Truth (vv. 35-41) does not seem to be part of the original story; one may perhaps compare the various embellishments in the story of Ahikar. André (192) points out parallels in the praise of Wisdom and refers to Wisd. iii. 9, where Truth has a deeper mystical significance as though synonymous with the God of Truth.

The decree of Darius and the return of Zerubbabel, iv. 42-v. 6. (a) The vow of Darius practically duplicates that of Cyrus, and both kings are curiously associated with the capture of Babylon in Jos. x. 11 4. That Cyrus was unable to fulfil his vow need not imply, as Büchler supposes, the existence of some specific tradition; it may be merely an attempt to justify this story of Darius, see *Introd.* p. 16. In any case the return of exiles under Zerubbabel in the reign of Darius (v. 6) is complicated by the references in v. 7 seqq. (E ii. seq.) to that of Cyrus. Since ii. 1-15 seems to be incomplete, it has been urged that the gap between E i. and ii. may be filled, partly at least, by E v. 1-6, reading *Cyrus for Darius* in v. 2 and adjusting or omitting v. 6 (see Ewald, 86; the comm. of Bertheau and Rysse; Sellin, *Stud.*, 112 seq.; Davies, 49 seq.). Against this see Schrader, 482 n. 6. It is otherwise held that v. 1-6 refer to a return, perhaps under Joakim (see v. 5), in the reign of Darius (De Saulcy and Kaulen [so Nikel, 52, 126]; Schrader; Keuss; Ryle, 15; André, 137-40). But it has been shown by Schrader (*loc. cit.*) and Torrey that this passage cannot be severed from the close of iv, and that both are of Semitic origin. The relationship between E i. and E iv. v. 1-6, 7 seqq. (E ii.) thus becomes more difficult, and Torrey (followed by Kent) would treat the Story of the Three Youths as an (Aramaic) interpolation in the (Hebrew) history of the time of Cyrus. Hence iv. 43-7, 57-61, and v. 6 a are regarded as redactional, linking the interpolated Darius story with the main narrative. The latter thus comprises E i. (E ii. 1-15), E iv. 47 a, 48 a ('and Cyrus the king wrote . . .'), 48 b-56, 62 seq., v. 1 seqq. (with *Cyrus* in v. 2, and in v. 6 reading only 'in the second year of the reign of Cyrus, king of Persia, in the month . . .'); see Torrey, *Journ. Bibl. Lit.*, xvi (1897), 168 seq., *Ezra Stud.*, 26, 32 seq., 58, 133; Kent, 340 seq. This would represent an earlier stage than the MT, but still furnishes a narrative, which both scholars regard as unhistorical, and which has been expanded by transferring E iv. 7 seqq. from its incorrect position before the reign of Darius to one equally incorrect in E ii. 16 seqq.

(b) Although the effort has been made to link together traditions of Cyrus and Darius, the interpolation-hypothesis brings fresh difficulties. The Story of the Three Pages (iii. 1-iv. 41), whatever its true origin and form, can only have been used because of its sequel. True, it could only have been inserted here, but a compiler was under no obligation to insert it, and the exhibition of rhetorical skill evidently served his purpose. The royal favour once obtained is turned to good account (cf. Est. v.), and unless the story had been already connected with Jewish history it is difficult to explain its presence. Only the fact that it deals with Darius and not Cyrus explains its survival, and the confusion arising from the effort to combine it with the history of the exiles is evidence of deliberate method. On these grounds, then, we have a bona-fide tradition—not necessarily a valuable one—of a return in the reign of Darius. Hence it is that ii. 16 seqq. seek to explain the delay between the time of Cyrus (who belongs to the past, ii. 30, iii. 1, iv. 44, 57) and that of Darius, and that Darius is represented partly as initiating (iv. 43, 47-56) and partly as endorsing (iv. 44, 57, see vi. 34) the return of the Jews. The whole is the result of a compromise. iv. 43-6 (Aramaic, Torrey, 29 n. 13) and 57-61 (Hebrew, *id.* 59) bear no resemblance to redactional patches (against Torrey, 57 seqq.). They actually bring new details (the valuable v. 45), and vv. 44, 57, by ignoring the return of the vessels in ii. 10-15, link conflicting traditions, but do not link an otherwise unnecessary interpolation with the tradition which runs through E i.-iii. Besides, it is not clear that the gap between E i. and ii. is filled by Torrey's restoration (see Bayer, 134) or that the attempt to fill it is (in view of the development of the Cyrus-tradition) at all necessary. It may be concluded,

I ESDRAS 4. 43-62

43 cousin. Then said he unto the king, Remember thy vow, which thou didst vow to build Jerusalem.
 44 in the day when thou camest to thy kingdom, and to send away all the vessels that were taken out
 of Jerusalem, which Cyrus set apart, when he vowed to destroy Babylon, and vowed to send them
 45 again thither. Thou didst also vow to build up the temple, which the Edomites burned when Judæa
 46 was made desolate by the Chaldeans. And now, O lord the king, this is that which I require, and
 which I desire of thee, and this is the princely liberality that shall proceed from thee: I pray there-
 fore that thou make good the vow, the performance whereof thou hast vowed to the King of heaven
 with thine own mouth.
 47 Then Darius the king stood up, and kissed him, and wrote letters for him unto all the treasurers
 and governors and captains and satraps, that they should safely bring on their way both him, and
 48 all those that should go up with him to build Jerusalem. He wrote letters also unto all the
 governors that were in Coelesyria and Phœnicia, and unto them in Libanus, that they should bring
 49 cedar wood from Libanus unto Jerusalem, and that they should build the city with him. Moreover
 he wrote for all the Jews that should go out of his realm up into Jewry, concerning their freedom,
 50 that no officer, no governor, no satrap, nor treasurer, should forcibly enter into their doors; and that
 all the country which they occupied should be free to them without tribute; and that the Edomites
 51 should give over the villages of the Jews which then they held: and that there should be yearly
 52 given twenty talents to the building of the temple, until the time that it were built; and other ten
 talents yearly, for burnt offerings to be presented upon the altar every day, as they had a command-
 53 ment to offer seventeen: and that all they that should come from Babylonia to build the city should
 54 have their freedom, as well they as their posterity, and all the priests that came. He wrote also to
 55 give them their charges, and the priests' vestments wherein they minister; and for the Levites he
 wrote that their charges should be given them until the day that the house were finished, and
 56 Jerusalem builded up. And he commanded to give to all that kept the city lands and wages. He
 sent away also all the vessels from Babylon, that Cyrus had set apart; and all that Cyrus had given
 in commandment, the same charged he also to be done, and sent unto Jerusalem.
 58 Now when this young man was gone forth, he lifted up his face to heaven toward Jerusalem, and
 59 praised the King of heaven, and said, From thee cometh victory, from thee cometh wisdom, and
 60 thine is the glory, and I am thy servant. Blessed art thou, who hast given me wisdom: and to thee
 61 I give thanks, O Lord of our fathers. And so he took the letters, and went out, and came unto
 62 Babylon, and told it all his brethren. And they praised the God of their fathers, because he had

therefore, that E iii. 1-v. 6 furnish a distinctive tradition of some return in the reign of Darius in accordance with his decree in vii. 48-56. See further on vi. seq.

On the text of iv. 42 seqq., see especially Torrey, 125 seqq.

43. Remember, \mathfrak{C}^2 + O king.

44. he vowed . . . Babylon, \mathfrak{S} om.; Gaab (see Fr.) and Torrey conj. 'when he began' ($\eta\rho\theta\alpha\rho\alpha$); \mathfrak{L} cum excideret (desolavit) B. Jos. § 58 omits all reference to Cyrus—'the vessels which Neb., having pillaged, carried to B.'

45. Edomites, cf. viii. 69. \mathfrak{C}^2 'Ιουδαίαι; \mathfrak{L} Lag. 'Chaldei cum desolata esset Iudæa.' Fr. cites MS. 44: . . . ἰουδαίαι Ναβ. See *Introd.* § 5 f.

46. O lord the king, cf. Dan. iv. 24.

and this is the . . .; 'and since such munificence is thine' (Torrey, 29 n. 13).

the vow . . . vowed, lit. 'the vow which thou didst vow.'

47. letters, lit. 'the letters', viz. which he desired. The reference is naturally to Darius and Zerubbabel; but on the theory that the story is an interpolation, Cyrus writes for Sheshbazzar (Torrey, Kent).

48. The grant of wood; see v. 55.

49. enter . . . doors. According to Jos. § 61 the royal taxes are remitted, cf. E vii. 24.

50. Edomites (\mathfrak{C}^2 Chaldeans). Jos. adds the Samaritans and people of Coelesyria.

51. twenty talents, \mathfrak{C}^2 \mathfrak{S} + 'of silver'. Jos. reads 'fifty', but omits the numbers in τ : 52.

temple, $\tau\acute{o}$ ἱερόν, probably בית המקדש; for בית \mathfrak{E} usually has ναός.

52. and other . . . yearly. \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{S} at end of verse, perhaps rightly.

seventeen should probably be omitted (Lupton, 69; Torrey, 127).

53. The reference to freedom seems out of place, see Buchler, 98 seq., who joins the last words ('and for all the priests . . .') to v. 54.

54. to give them, cf. \mathfrak{C}^2 δοθῆναι.

charges, χορηγία. In τ : 55, Jos. § 62 has 'for the Levites, the musical instruments ($\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ἄργανα) wherewith they praise God'. With the interest in the Levites, cf. E vii. 24, and especially N xi. 23.

56. kept ($\phi\rho\alpha\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$) the city; Jos. + 'and the temple'; on his paraphrase of the verse, see Buchler, 99 n. 3.

58. toward Jerusalem, cf. Dan. vi. 10, Tob. iii. 11 seq. With the prayer cf. E vii. 27, Dan. ii. 19, 20, 23.

59. \mathfrak{C}^2 'counsel ($\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta$) and wisdom and victory, and thine is the glory'; so \mathfrak{L} , transposing 'wisdom' and 'victory'. Origen, *Hom. ix. in Iosuanam*, quotes from 'Esdras': 'a te Domine est victoria et ego servus tuus, benedictus es Deus veritatis' (cf. τ : 40).

60. give thanks, rather 'praise'.

62. God of their fathers, cf. E vii. 27, viii. 28, x. 11.

- 63 given them freedom and liberty to go up, and to build Jerusalem, and the temple which is called by his name: and they feasted with instruments of music and gladness seven days.
- 5 1 After this were the chiefs of fathers' houses chosen to go up according to their tribes, with their 2 wives and sons and daughters, with their menservants and maidservants, and their cattle. And Darius sent with them a thousand horsemen, till they had brought them back to Jerusalem safely, 3 and with musical instruments, tabrets and flutes. And all their brethren played, and he made them go up together with them.
- 4 And these are the names of the men which went up, according to their families amongst their 5 tribes, after their several divisions. The priests, the sons of Phinees, the sons of Aaron: Jesus the son of Josedeck, the son of Saraias, and Joakim the son of Zerobabel, the son of Salathiel, of the 6 house of David, of the lineage of Phares, of the tribe of Judah; who spake wise sentences before Darius the king of Persia in the second year of his reign, in the month Nisan, which is the first month.
- 7 And these are they of Jewry that came up | Now these are the children of the province, 2 1

Ezra 2 1

63, which is called . . . E^{A} $\text{ὅτι ἀνομάσθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῶν}$; a Hebraism, cf. 2 Chron. vi. 33, vii. 14, *E* vi. 33, feasted, *Jos.* § 66 $\text{τὴν ἀνάστην καὶ παλιγγεσίαν τῆς πατρίδος ἰορτίζοντες}$.

V. 2, brought . . . back, E^{A} ἀποκαταστήσει, E^{B} ἀποκατασκευάσει.

safely, mg. *with peace*, a literal rendering in the Greek of the Hebrew term. For the escort, cf. *E* viii. 22, N ii. 9.

3. And all . . . E^{A} MSS. nos. 55, 58 omit 'and'; the brethren were naturally the musicians, cf. *v.* 42 below, he made . . . E^{B} 'they'. Restore perhaps (after Torrey, 130) 'played and were sending them (on their way) as they went up'. Cf. *Jos.*, and possibly (so Lupton) Tertullian, *De Cor. Milit.* ix. 'facilius cum tympanis et tibiis et psalteriis revertens de captivitate Babyloniae quam cum coronis', &c.

4. Cf. viii. 28; the *tribal* arrangement also recalls *E*'s twelve lay-families.

5. Read 'of the priests' (Torrey, 131), cf. *E* viii. 2, where also priests are mentioned first (cf. *E* iii. 2, but contrast *iv.* 3, v. 2).

Phinees (Phinehas), the son (E^{A} S) + of Eleazar the son of Aaron (E^{B}).

and Joakim the son of Z. E^{B} ὁ καὶ Ζ. , thus identifying, cf. *Zer.* and Sheshbazzar in vi. 18. This genealogy conflicts with that of Zerubbabel in 1 Chron. iii. 19 seqq., and Joakim the priest was the son of Jeshua (N xii. 10, 26). Some (e.g. Fr., Reuss) accept Joakim as the original hero of the story in iii. seq. and as the leader of a return in the reign of Darius. Büchler (56) would read 'and Zer. the son of Shealtiel the son of Joakim' (i.e. the king), corresponding to Jeshua the grandson of the priest Seraiah. Similarly Bayer (121 seq.) who also reads 'Jeshua the son . . . of Seraiah, the son of Phinehas, the son of Aaron the priest'. Torrey (131) suggests 'and there rose up with him Zer.' (וַיָּרֹם עִיָּהוּ , cf. li. 8). This is attractive but seems rather abrupt. The analogy of *E* viii. 2 would suggest the presence of priestly and Davidic representatives. Such is the confusion, however, in the history of the return that 'Joakim the son of' may conceivably be an insertion on the view that Zer. (identified with Sheshbazzar) had already led a return in the time of Cyrus. On the intricacies see *Introd.* p. 15 seq.

6, which is . . . rather 'on the first of the month' (Fr.; Jahn; Torrey, 27, 61). The date is properly not that when Zer. gained the king's ear (cf. N ii. 1, also the first month), but of the departure (see *E* viii. 6), and, although it conflicts with *v.* 57, the mention of the year is presupposed by the reference in *v.* 47. Note the care to give dates in *E* vii. 7 seq., viii. 31, &c.

The Register of the Return. *v.* 7-46 = *E* ii, N vii. 6-73; *Jos.* xi. 3 to merely gives a brief summary. This list is the foundation-stone of the canonical post-exilic history, its authenticity a matter of keen dispute among those who have investigated this period, its essential trustworthiness accepted even by those who reject almost all that remains for the time of Cyrus (*E* i-iv. 5). Its problems involve the entire structure of *E-N*. It is the list of those who returned 'every man to his own city' (*E* *v.* 8), thus connecting in the most realistic manner the large community (the *kāhāl*) which returned to the land of their ancestors with the pre-exilic population. It is no less closely connected with subsequent events in *E-N*; note the families in *Ezra's* band several decades later (see on *E* viii. 28-40), the enumeration in *E* ix. 21 seqq., the signatories of the covenant (N x.), and the various lists in N xii. As a whole the list may be likened to the register of the children of Israel before the Exodus (Gen. xvi. 8-27) and after the settlement (Num. xxvi. 1-51, 1 Chron. ii-viii.).

As a Register of the Return it ignores both the many Jews who had never left Palestine or who may have fled (perhaps temporarily) into Egypt, and the South Judaeans families who had moved northwards into the neighbourhood of Jerusalem (1 Chron. ii.). Confining itself to the deportation by Nebuchadnezzar it ignores other returns (on the assumption that *Zech.* vi. 9 seq. do not represent an isolated occurrence). It implies the possibility of a very easy settlement by the exiles among the people of the land (contrast the tradition in *E* iv. 50); and the manifest improbability that the families could return after many years each to its old abode cannot be explained away (with Meyer, 151, and others) in view of the explicit statements in *v.* 46 seq. Moreover, the list includes the common people (see 2 Kings xxix. 14, 16), numbers Zerubbabel alone among the Davidic descendants, and apparently excludes guilds of artisans (2 Kings, *l.c.*). Although the numbers (*v.* 41) have been skillfully defended, considerable perplexity is caused by the place-names enumerated (see Elhorst, *Th. F.* xxix, 97 seq.; Koster, *ib.* xxx, 499 seq., xxxi, 531; Nikel, 57 seq.). Whether the list enumerates families carried off at the exile or applies to the new settlers—and those who accept the list are divided on this very important question—it is very difficult to account for the absence of some places (Nikel, 54 seq.) and the presence of others (Meyer, 105 seqq., 190). Moreover, the list implies a careful retention of the various local origins and divisions of the ecclesiastical and lay families during the years of exile, although once in Palestine there are, as is to be expected, continual changes and developments (Koster, *E. H.* col. 1483, § 8). No doubt some of the personal names are old, but it is improbable that such family-names as Jeshua, Pahath-moab, Elam, Bigvai (better *Bigoi* *E* *v.* 14), and Aspadath (*E* Aspharatus *v.* 8) are of pre-exilic date. It also assumes the existence

from the captivity, where they dwelt as strangers, whom Nabuchodonosor the king of Babylon had carried away unto Babylon.

8 And they returned
unto Jerusalem, and to the other parts of Jewry,
every man to his own city, who came with Zoro-
babel, with Jesus, Nehemias, and Zariaias, Resaias,
Eneneus, Mardocheus, Beelsarus, Aspharusus,
9 Reelias, Roimus, and Baana, their leaders. The
number of them of the nation, and their leaders:
the sons of Phoros, two thousand a hundred
seventy and two: the sons of Saphat, four
10 hundred seventy and two: the sons of Ares,
11 seven hundred fifty and six: the sons of Phaath
Moab, of the sons of Jesus and Joab, two thou-
sand eight hundred and twelve:
12 the sons of
Elam, a thousand two hundred fifty and four:
the sons of Zathui, nine hundred forty and five:
13 the sons of Chorbe, seven hundred and five: the
sons of Bani, six hundred forty and eight: the
sons of Bebai, six hundred twenty and three:

that went up out of the captivity of those which
had been carried away, whom Nebuchadnezzar
the king of Babylon had carried away unto
Babylon, and that returned unto Jerusalem and
Judah, every one unto his city; which came with
2 Zerubbabel, Jeshua, Nehemiah, Seraiah, Reelaiah,
Mordecai, Bilshan, Mispar, Bigvai, Rehum, Ba-
anah. The number of the men of the people of
Israel:

the children of Parosh, two thousand ;
an hundred seventy and two.

The children of 4
Shephatiah, three hundred seventy and two.
The children of Arah, seven hundred seventy 5
and five. The children of Pahath-moab, of the 6
children of Jeshua and Joab, two thousand eight
hundred and twelve. The children of Elam, a 7
thousand two hundred fifty and four. The chil- 8
dren of Zattu, nine hundred forty and five. The 9
children of Zaccai, seven hundred and threescore.
The children of Bani, six hundred forty and two. 10
The children of Bebai, six hundred twenty and 11

of trustworthy genealogies (*v.* 37 seqq.) which apparently were not preserved at Babylon, but were cherished by the natives of Judah. Such lists as are incorporated in Chron. (especially 1 Chron. xxiv., which has several points of resemblance with the E-N lists) are on critical grounds practically valueless for the pre-exilic age, and it is necessary, therefore, to suppose that—if the great list is genuine—the older genealogical records have disappeared (see Meyer, 140, 160 seqq.). On the other hand, one important list which vitally conflicts with this is preserved in Neh. iii., and, as Ed. Meyer was the first to observe, testifies to the prominence of an indigenous population, secular and ecclesiastical, wherein the presence of the South Judaean groups may be recognized. But that list testifies also to the weakness of any body of Babylonian exiles; see *Introd.* § 5 (*c*).

While this list forms the backbone of the biblical post-exilic history and is in a context where the events are closely interconnected (*viz.* the generous decree, the great return, the steps to reorganize religious conditions), the evidence of Haggai and Zechariah (520 B.C.) renders the whole context untrustworthy (so even Meyer, pp. 49, 73, 98 seq., 191). These prophets ignore the presence of this great community (see *Introd.* § 4. H.), and the successful opposition as described in *E v.* 66 seqq. 'shows how small a number had really returned' (G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, ii, 298 seq.). Certain considerations might support the genuineness of the list and its context (see Davies, 14, 80; Torrey, 144), but the weight of evidence, and the recognition that the list has been subsequently 'edited' (Holzhey, 15; Davies, 51), or may comprise the result of several returns between 538 and 520 or 516 (Sellin, *Ser.* 7, *Stud.* 42, 108 seq., 115, 158), indicate that whatever return or returns took place the list and the context describe events in such a way that the historical facts cannot be recovered by any internal criticism of the narratives.

The list appears in the account of Nehemiah (*c.* 444) where it is treated as that of 'the children of the province', and should incorporate those native families who had separated from the heathen (*E vii.* 6, 13); see *Introd.* p. 9. On internal grounds *N vii.* (not necessarily in its present form) appears to be its earlier form, and it is noteworthy that *E* and to a greater extent *E* show traces of some adjustment of the list to the history before the building of the Temple (see below). On the minutiae of the list, see Smend (who notes frequent agreement with *N*, so also Bayer, 38); Moulton, *ZATW*, xix, 246 seq.; Meyer, 141 seqq., and Bayer, 42 seqq., and, besides the comm., the several articles in *E Bl.* The readings in the R.V. mg., with the identifications of the more difficult names, have been omitted in the notes here and in the other lists, viii, 29 seqq., ix, 19 seqq., &c.

7. captivity . . . Ἐ τῆς ἀρχαίας τῆς παροίας (Ἐ ἀποικίας).

8. The leaders are twelve in number (cf. the tribes, and see on *v.* 4) through the insertion of Eneneus (= Nahamani *N vii.* 7). *N* reads 'who came with Zer. and Jeshua and Neh.:' Azariah . . . Mispereth, Ezra, Bigvai . . . Baanah, Maspar'; cf. the old view that the return of Zer. was contemporary with that of *N* or *E*. (see *Introd.* p. 10 *a*). Among the important variants are *E Zariaias* (*E Seraiah*, *N Azariah*); *Resaias* (*E Reelaiah*, *N Raamiah*, see *E Bl.*, 3997); *Beelsarus* (*N Bilshan*, see *E Bl.*, 574); *Aspharusus* (? Pers. Asparata; Marq. 35); *Reelias* (i.e. Reelaiah, *N Bigvai*); *Roimus* (*N Rehum*, *N Nehum* = Ἐ in *E*). Jos. xi. 3 § 73 seq. mentions besides Zer. and Jeshua two names of prominent donors (see *v.* 44 seq.), Mordecai (see on vii. 15) and Sherebiah.

9-23. The lay-families. *E* 15 seq. add *Kilau* (? Kellah), *Azetax* (? Azekah), *Azaru* or *Azuru* (cf. Asara *v.* 31, or *Azur* *N x.* 17), *Annis* or *Annias* (cf. Hananiah, or Hodiah *N x.* 18). For *Arom* cf. *Harim*, *E* 32 (wanting in *E*, unless *Chorbe* *v.* 12 represents it and not *Zaccai*; see *N x.* 14) or *Hashum* (*E* 19 before *Gibbar* [see below]; *N x.* 18 before *Bezai* [*E* Bassai]). On these additions see also Bayer, 43 seqq., 75. For the compound *Arsaphuvith*, cf. *Juah* *E* 18 = *Hariph* *N vii.* 24 (Ἐ^m + the children of Asen'), *x.* 19. *Baltesus* (note the number) takes the place of *Gibbar* (*E*) or *Gibson* (*N*): cf. perhaps Hether, Josh. xv. 19 Ἐ and see Guthe, *SBOT*. With the *Chadistai*, cf. perhaps Hadashah, Josh. xv. 37, or Adasa, 1 Macc. vii. 40; and with the *Amudiai*, perhaps Modin, 1 Macc. ii. 1, or Migdal-Gad, or Middin (Ball); Bayer (45 seq.) discovers the names Hashum and Hodijah. In *v.* 21 *Ai* is wanting, and if *Niphish* represents *Magbich* (*E* only, cf. Magpiash *N x.* 20), the men of Nebo, the other Elam (cf. *E* 31) and Harim (see *E* 39, *E* 25) are absent. *Calamolalus* (Ἐ^m-calus) and *Onus* represent *Lod*, *Hudid* and *Ano*.

the sons of Astad, a thousand three hundred
14 twenty and two: the sons of Adonikam, six
hundred sixty and seven: the sons of Bagoi, two
thousand sixty and six:

the sons of Adinu, four
15 hundred fifty and four: the sons of Ater, of
Ezekias, ninety and two: the sons of Kilan and
Azetas, threescore and seven: the sons of Azaru,
16 four hundred thirty and two: the sons of Annis,
a hundred and one: the sons of Arom: the sons
of Bassai, three hundred twenty and three: the
17 sons of Arsiphurith, a hundred and twelve: the
sons of Baierus, three thousand and five: the
sons of Bethlomon, a hundred twenty and three:
18 they of Netophas, fifty and five: they of Ana-
thoth, a hundred fifty and eight: they of Bethas-
19 moth, forty and two: they of Kariathiarus,
twenty and five: they of Caphira and Beroth,
20 seven hundred forty and three: the Chadiasai
and Ammidioi, four hundred twenty and two:
they of Kirama and Gabbe, six hundred twenty
21 and one: they of Macalon, a hundred twenty
and two: they of Betolon, fifty and two: the
sons of Niphis, a hundred fifty and six:

the sons
22 of Calamolalus and Onus, seven hundred twenty
and five: the sons of Jerechu, three hundred
23 forty and five: the sons of Sanaas, three thou-
sand three hundred and thirty. The priests:
the sons of Jeddu, the son of Jesus, among the
sons of Sanasib, nine hundred seventy and two:
the sons of Emmeruth, a thousand fifty and two:
25 the sons of Phassurus, a thousand two hundred
forty and seven: the sons of Charme, a thousand
and seventeen.

The Levites: the sons of Jesus,
26 and Kadmiel, and Bannas, and Sudias, seventy
and four. The holy-singers: the sons of Asaph,
27 a hundred twenty and eight. The porters: the
sons of Salum, the sons of Atar, the sons of
Tolman, the sons of Dacubi, the sons of Ateta,
the sons of Sabi, in all a hundred thirty and nine.

29 The temple-servants: the sons of Esau, the sons
of Asipha, the sons of Tabaath, the sons of
Keras, the sons of Sua, the sons of Phaleas, the

three. The children of Azgad, a thousand two
12 hundred twenty and two. The children of
13 Adonikam, six hundred sixty and six. The
14 children of Bigvai, two thousand fifty and six.
The children of Adin, four hundred fifty and
15 four. The children of Ater, of Hezekiah, ninety
16 and eight.

The children of Bezai, three hundred
17 twenty and three. The children of Jorah, an
18 hundred and twelve. The children of Hashum,
19 two hundred twenty and three. The children of
20 Gibbar, ninety and five. The children of Beth-
21 lehem, an hundred twenty and three. The men
22 of Netophah, fifty and six. The men of Ana-
23 thoth, an hundred twenty and eight. The chil-
24 dren of Azmaveth, forty and two. The children
25 of Kiriath-arim, Chephirah, and Beeroth, seven
hundred and forty and three. The children of
26 Ramah and Geba, six hundred twenty and one.
The men of Michmas, an hundred twenty and
27 two. The men of Beth-el and Ai, two hundred
28 twenty and three. The children of Nebo, fifty
29 and two. The children of Magbish, an hundred
30 fifty and six. The children of the other Elam,
31 a thousand two hundred fifty and four. The
32 children of Harim, three hundred and twenty.
The children of Lod, Hadid, and Ono, seven
33 hundred twenty and five. The children of
34 Jericho, three hundred forty and five. The
35 children of Senaah, three thousand and six
hundred and thirty. The priests: the children
36 of Jedaiah, of the house of Jeshua, nine hundred
seventy and three.

The children of Immer, a
37 thousand fifty and two. The children of Pashhur,
38 a thousand two hundred forty and seven. The
39 children of Harim, a thousand and seventeen.
The Levites: the children of Jeshua and Kad-
40 miel, of the children of Hodaviah, seventy and
four. The singers: the children of Asaph, an
41 hundred twenty and eight. The children of the
42 porters: the children of Shallum, the children of
Ater, the children of Talmon, the children of
Akkub, the children of Hatita, the children
of Shobai, in all an hundred thirty and nine.
The Nethinim: the children of Ziha, the children
43 of Hasupha, the children of Tabaath; the chil-
44 dren of Keros, the children of Siaha, the children

24 seq. The priests. The family of Jedaiah is ascribed to Sanasib (𐤍𐤍 Enassibe) i.e. Eliashib, grandson of Jeshua and grandfather of Jaddua (N xii. 10-12); Meyer, 169; Batten, *SBOT*, 59. The omission of Eliashib in E.N. is more explicable on view of the foreign alliance in N xiii. 4, 28) than its presence in E. The reference to Jeshua may be due to insertion. Apart from this it is noteworthy that there is little variation in the versions, perhaps an indication of the lateness of the list of the priests (*SBOT loc. cit.*).

26. The Levites. As regards the small number, it may be noticed that certain Levitical families, at all events, appear not to have been deported, so Henadad (see v. 58), and also the Korahites (Meyer, *Israel*, 352 n. 5), see Meyer, *Ent.* 167, 177, Nikel, 86 (from another standpoint), and *Introd.* § 5 (c).

29 seqq. The Nethinim. E (but not 𐤍𐤍, which is as usual corrected after the MT) adds *Uta* (? cf. *Uthai*, E viii. 14), *Ketab* (or *Ketam*, cf. N vii. 48 𐤍𐤍), and see Torrey, 89 seq., Bayer, 52), *Chasaba* (? cf. *Chezib*, *Cozbi*), *Asara* (see *Asara*, v. 15, and cf. *Hasrah*, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 22), *Pharatham* (see E. *ii.*, 3686) and *Cutha* (? cf. the Cuthueans, or, with Bayer, *Sotai*, E 55).

30 sons of Labana, the sons of Aggaba, the sons of
Acud, the sons of Uta, the sons of Ketab, the
sons of Accaba, the sons of Subai, the sons of
Anan, the sons of Cathua, the sons of Geddur,
31 the sons of Jairus, the sons of Daisan, the sons of
Noeba, the sons of Chaseba, the sons of Gazera,
the sons of Ozias, the sons of Phinoe, the sons of
Asara, the sons of Basthai, the sons of Asana,
the sons of Maani, the sons of Naphisi,

the sons
of Acub, the sons of Achipha, the sons of Asur,
32 the sons of Pharakim, the sons of Basaloth, the
sons of Meedda, the sons of Cutha, the sons of
Charca, the sons of Barchus, the sons of Serar,
the sons of Thomci, the sons of Nasi, the sons of
Atipha.

33 The sons of the servants of Solomon:
the sons of Assaphioth, the sons of Pharida,

the
sons of Jeeli, the sons of Lozon, the sons of
34 Isdael, the sons of Saphuthi, the sons of Agia,
the sons of Phacareth, the sons of Sabie, the sons
of Sarothic, the sons of Masias, the sons of Gas,
the sons of Addus, the sons of Subas, the sons of
Apherra, the sons of Barodis, the sons of Saphat,
35 the sons of Allon. All the temple-servants, and
the sons of the servants of Solomon, were three

36 hundred seventy and two. These came up from
Thermeleth, and Thelersas, Charaathalan lead-
ing them, and Allar: and they could not shew
37 their families, nor their stock, how they were of
Israel: the sons of Dalan the son of Ban, the
sons of Nekodan, six hundred fifty and two.

38 And of the priests, they that usurped the office
of the priesthood and were not found: the sons
of Obdia, the sons of Akkos, the sons of Jaddus,
who married Augia one of the daughters of
39 Zorzelleus, and was called after his name. And
when the description of the kindred of these men
was sought in the register, and was not found,
they were removed from executing the office of
40 the priesthood: for unto them said Nehemias
and Aththarias, that they should not be partakers

of Padon; the children of Lebanah, the children
45 of Hagabah, the children of Akkub; the children
46 of Hagab, the children of Shamlai, the children
of Hanan; the children of Giddel, the children of
47 Gahar, the children of Reaiah; the children of
48 Rezin, the children of Nekoda, the children of
Gazzam; the children of Uzza, the children of
49 Paseah, the children of Besai; the children of
50 Asnah, the children of Meunim, the children of
Nephisim; the children of Bakbuk, the children
51 of Hakupha, the children of Harhur; the chil-
52 dren of Bazluth, the children of Mehida, the
children of Harsha;

the children of Barkos, the
53 children of Sisera, the children of Temah; the
54 children of Neziah, the children of Hatipha.
The children of Solomon's servants: the children
55 of Sotai, the children of Hassophereth, the chil-
dren of Peruda; the children of Jaalah, the
56 children of Darkon, the children of Giddel; the
57 children of Shephatiah, the children of Hattil,
the children of Pochereth-hazzebaim, the chil-
dren of Ami.

All the Nethinim, and the chil- 58
dren of Solomon's servants, were three hundred 59
ninety and two. And these were they which
went up from Tel-melah, Tel-harsha, Cherub,
Addan, and Immer: but they could not shew
their fathers' houses, and their seed, whether
they were of Israel: the children of Delaiah, the
60 children of Tobiah, the children of Nekoda, six
hundred fifty and two. And of the children of
61 the priests: the children of Habaiah, the children
of Hakkoz, the children of Barzillai, which took
a wife of the daughters of Barzillai the Gileadite,
and was called after their name. These sought
62 their register among those that were reckoned
by genealogy, but they were not found: there-
fore were they deemed polluted and put from
the priesthood. And the Tirshatha said unto
63 them, that they should not eat of the most holy

33 seq. Servants of Solomon. E (but not G) omits *Sotai*, severs (with G of E-N) *Pochereth-hazzebaim*, and between the latter and *Ami* (E; N *Anon*, E *Allon*) inserts eight names, on which see E Bi.

36. See the comm. *Leading* is apparently based upon a doublet of *Tel-harsha* (טלרשה), as though connected with רשף (רשף) 'head, leader': but see v. 8 end.

37. *Dalan*, G^a *asor*, MT *Delaiah*. *Ban*, marg. *Daanan* (G^a), but MT *Tobiah* (cf. N vi. 17 seq., xiii, 4), though with the addition of *Sona*, E G^a, N G^a. *Nekodan*, cf. v. 31 (E *Noeba*).

38. *And of the priests* (similarly N 63), they that claimed . . . (οἱ ἐπιπορεύοντες [G^a *servantes*] ἱερωσύνης). *Obdia*, G^a *Obbeia*, N *Hobaiah*. The family of *Hakkoz*, according to the traditional view, had been legitimate (1 Chron. xxiv, 10), was now deposed, but was subsequently reinstated and held a prominent place (N iii, 4, 21, E viii, 33). If this list is of the time of Zerubbabel we must explain the retention of the name in N vii, 63 and its omission in N x, xii. (cf. *Kosters*, *Th. T.*, xxxi, 539). The passage has not the value set upon it (notably by Meyer, 170, who compares the *Calebite* *Kos*, 1 Chron. iv, 8; see also *Jampel* i, 313), but only shows that at some period the legitimacy of the family was evidently doubtful.

the sons of *Jaddus*, apparently *Jaddua*; note the variant text in E.

40. *Aththarias*, i.e. the *Tirshatha* (cf. ix, 49). The verb (*dece*) is in the singular and G^a (see A.V. mg.) identifies the two. E reads only *Nehemias*, and MT only the *Tirshatha* (cf. the variants in E ix, 49). Even if the identification be due to a gloss (Fr., cf. *Bayer*, 53) it must serve a purpose (as in iv, 13, vi, 18), and it is only intelligible if the list belonged originally to the history of N's age (see W. R. Smith, *Ency. Brit.*, 9th ed., art. 'Haggai', xi, 370; *Harvey*, *Expos.*, 1893, vii, p. 440; *Howorth*, *PSBA*, xxiii, 309 seq.). The mitigated form of the decision in the MT is probably

of the holy things, till there arose up a high
 41 priest wearing Urim and Thummim. So all
 they of Israel, from twelve years old and up-
 ward, beside menservants and womenservants,
 42 were in number forty and two thousand three
 hundred and sixty. Their menservants and
 handmaids were seven thousand three hundred
 thirty and seven: the minstrels and singers, two
 hundred forty and five:
 43 four hundred thirty and
 five camels, seven thousand thirty and six horses,
 two hundred forty and five mules, five thousand
 five hundred twenty and five beasts of burden.
 44 And certain of the chief men of their families,
 when they came to the temple of God that is in
 Jerusalem, vowed to set up the house again in
 45 its own place according to their ability, and to
 give into the holy treasury of the works a thou-
 sand pounds of gold, five thousand of silver, and
 a hundred priestly vestments.
 46 And the priests
 and the Levites and they that were of the people
 dwelt in Jerusalem and the country; the holy
 singers also and the porters and all Israel in their
 villages.
 47 But when the seventh month was at hand,
 and when the children of Israel were every man
 in his own place, they came all together with
 one consent into the broad place before the first
 48 porch which is toward the east. Then stood up
 Jesus the son of Josedek, and his brethren the
 priests, and Zerubbabel the son of Salathiel, and
 his brethren, and made ready the altar of the
 49 God of Israel, to offer burnt sacrifices upon it,
 according as it is expressly commanded in the

things, till there stood up a priest with Urim
 and with Thummim. The whole congregation 64
 together was forty and two thousand three
 hundred and threescore,

beside their menservants 65
 and their maidservants, of whom there were seven
 thousand three hundred thirty and seven: and
 they had two hundred singing men and singing
 women. Their horses were seven hundred thirty 66
 and six; their mules, two hundred forty and
 five; their camels, four hundred thirty and five; 67
 their asses, six thousand seven hundred and
 twenty. And some of the heads of fathers' 68
 houses, when they came to the house of the
 Lord which is in Jerusalem, offered willingly for
 the house of God to set it up in its place: they 69
 gave after their ability into the treasury of the
 work threescore and one thousand darics of gold,
 and five thousand pound of silver, and one hun-
 dred priests' garments. So the priests, and the 70
 Levites, and some of the people, and the singers,
 and the porters, and the Nethinim, dwelt in their
 cities, and all Israel in their cities.

And when the seventh month was come, and 31
 the children of Israel were in the cities, the
 people gathered themselves together as one
 man to Jerusalem.

Then stood up Jeshua the 2
 son of Jozadak, and his brethren the priests,
 and Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, and his
 brethren, and builded the altar of the God of
 Israel, to offer burnt offerings thereon, as it is
 written in the law of Moses the man of God.

less original (Guthe, Bertholet, Jahn); instead of being removed, the priests are forbidden to share in the most holy things, which were restricted to the Aaronites.

41. For the age-limit (also in Jos.) cf. Luke ii. 42.

42. For the minstrels cf. v. 2 seq., and see Meyer, 192.

43. The horses and mules are wanting in good MSS. of N.

44 seq. E and E omit N vi. 70, which refers vaguely to the donations of the heads 'to the work' and mentions the gifts of the Tirshatha (i.e. Nehemiah, so G^h), and also ib. 72, the gifts of the rest of the people, although the priestly garments are recorded. The emphasis upon the proposed building of the temple, natural in EE, is wanting in N, although the record there professes to be taken from the history of the time of Zerubbabel (N vii. 5). For the view that EE represent a less original form of the passage, see Meyer, 195; Wellh., GGN, 1895, p. 176; Nikel, 75 n. 1; Sellin, *Stud.*, 110; Guthe, *SPOT*. For the general situation, cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 6 seqq.

46. On the date of MT and the versions, see the comm. The mention of Jerusalem here and ix. 37 presupposes the completion of the rebuilding of the city: the omission in MT may be due to the context: in E, the city has not yet been restored, in N it is still poorly inhabited and barely ready. Elsewhere, in 1 Chron. ix. 2, N xi. 3, 20 there is a distinction between Jerusalem and the outside villages. In N xi. some of the ecclesiastical body dwell in the city (v. 21), but others live in the villages (N xii. 28 seq., cf. 1 Chron. ix. 16), and in N xiii. 10 Levites and singers have deserted and returned to their abodes. In 1 Chron. xiii. 2, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 2, they are summoned, especially when new conditions are inaugurated, or when (xxix. 4) the temple-service is resumed (cf. the dedication of the walls, N xii. 27 seq.), or when fresh arrangements are made for them (2 Chron. xxxi. 19).

The Rebuilding of the Altar and the Foundation of the Temple. v. 47-65 = E iii., cf. Jos. xi. 4 1-2. The description of the resumption of the Levitical service (cf. 1 Chron. xxiii. 31, 2 Chron. ii. 4, viii. 12 seq.) begins with the congregating of the exiles (now 'the children of Israel') in the seventh month. This is the first year of the return (cf. v. 36 [Cyrus] and the preliminary date v. 6 [Darius]). In N vii. 73 b, viii. 1, it is the first year of N's return (after the completion of the walls, vi. 15), and it introduces the Reading of the Law, which in E ix. 37 b, 38 seq. is the sequel to the purging of the community (cf. probably E v. 36-40 and the allusions in vii. 6, 13). The scene of the assembly in v. 47 (cf. 2 Chron. xxix. 4, a story of the restoration of the Temple after some disaster, v. 9) presupposes the existence of the Temple, as in ix. 6 (E. x. 9), 38 (N viii. 1), and, therefore, a later context in the history (cf. the later background of the preceding list). The MT has consequently altered the wording (see Bertholet, Guthe).

50 book of Moses the man of God. And certain
were gathered unto them out of the other nations
of the land, and they erected the altar upon its
own place, because all the nations of the land
were at enmity with them, and oppressed them;
and they offered sacrifices according to the time,
and burnt offerings to the Lord both morning
51 and evening. Also they held the feast of tabernacles,
as it is commanded in the law, and offered
sacrifices daily, as was meet:

52 and after that, the continual oblations, and the sacrifices of the
sabbaths, and of the new moons, and of all the
consecrated feasts.

53 And all they that had made
any vow to God began to offer sacrifices to God
from the new moon of the seventh month,
although the temple of God was not yet built.
54 And they gave money unto the masons and
55 carpenters; and meat and drink, and cars unto
them of Sidon and Tyre, that they should bring
cedar trees from Libanus, and convey them in
floats to the haven of Joppa, according to the
commandment which was written for them by
56 Cyrus king of the Persians. And in the second
year after his coming to the temple of God at
Jerusalem, in the second month, began Zerubbabel
the son of Salathiel, and Jesus the son of Josedek,
and their brethren, and the priests the Levites,
and all they that were come unto Jerusalem out
57 of the captivity: and they laid the foundation of
the temple of God on the new moon of the second
month, in the second year after they were come
58 to Jewry and Jerusalem. And they appointed
the Levites from twenty years old over the works

And they set the altar upon its base: for fear 4
was upon them because of the people of the
countries: and they offered burnt offerings
thereon unto the Lord, even burnt offerings
morning and evening.

And they kept the feast 4
of tabernacles, as it is written, and offered the
daily burnt offerings by number, according to
the ordinance, as the duty of every day required;
and afterward the continual burnt offering, and 5
the offerings of the new moons, and of all the set
feasts of the Lord that were consecrated, and of
every one that willingly offered a freewill offering
unto the Lord. From the first day of the seventh 6
month began they to offer burnt offerings unto
the Lord: but the foundation of the temple of
the Lord was not yet laid.

They gave money 7
also unto the masons, and to the carpenters; and
meat, and drink, and oil, unto them of Sidon,
and to them of Tyre, to bring cedar trees from
Lebanon to the sea, unto Joppa, according to
the grant that they had of Cyrus king of Persia.

Now in the second year of their coming unto 8
the house of God at Jerusalem, in the second
month, began Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel,
and Jeshua the son of Jozadak, and the rest of
their brethren the priests and the Levites, and
all they that were come out of the captivity unto
Jerusalem;

and appointed the Levites, from
twenty years old and upward, to have the over-

50. upon its own place: cf. E. R.V. mg. in its place.

And certain . . . and because all . . . are doublets (L om. the latter), MT has only for fear . . . countries (נִרְאָה represented in E by נִרְאָה; E^g om. the clause). L's reading finds parallels in 1 Macc. v. 1-2, and possibly N iv. 12 (MT v. 6), where the enemy come up against the builders (see comm.).

oppressed (καταχρησασα), may point to נִרְאָה and they strengthened themselves' (see Berth.), or נִרְאָה and they [the foreigners] strengthened them' (Ewald, 101 n. 4; Bayer 25 compares v. 66).

to the Lord and according to the time (L om.) are based on doublets in G (κύριος, καιρός); for the sacrifices, cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 40. Jos. § 76 reads simply ταῦτα δι' ποιήσατε οὐκ ἴσαν ἐν ἡδογῇ τοῖς προσχαίσις ἰδῶσθε πάντα αὐτοῖς ἀνεχθαιμένους.

52. sabbaths; appropriate, see Num. xxviii. 9 seq.; 2 Chron. ii. 4, viii. 13.

53. seventh month, mg. first (E^g).

although . . . Jos. § 78: 'they also began the building of the temple.' MT laid; for the use of יָסַד, see E iii. 10. 2 Chron. iii. 3, xxiv. 27 (R.V. mg.).

55. Cf. 2 Chron. ii. 8-10, 15 seq.

cars (MT and G oil); χάρη (G^a? חַרְמָה for חַרְמָה), kappa (A) καρφα (L), καρπός (58), καρφα, &c., &c. G^a explains Jos. § 78 τοῖς τε Σιδωνίους ἡδὲ καὶ τυρίων ἡν, &c., and L cum guntio et dederunt carra (cf. A.V.). The grant in question is referred to only in the decree of Darius (iv. 48, cf. N ii. 8, Artaxerxes). Jos. here and in v. 71 characteristically combines Cyrus and Darius on the lines of iv. 57 (D. commands what had been commanded by C.). But, apart from other questions, was Cyrus in a position to make this grant (Ryle, 43)?

56. A new paragraph, note the order Zer. and Jeshua (contrast v. 48), and the parentage (see v. 68 and vi. 2).

second year, G^a (which is often corrected after MT) and L^a add 'of Darius' (but E^g τῆς ἀεισεως αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν αἶον . . .) in agreement with Haggai and Zechariah; see *Introd.* p. 16 (foot). For the second month cf. 1 Kings vi. 1.

the priests the Levites, G^a inserts and with MT, cf. v. 63.

58. For the age-limit of the Levites, cf. the secondary passages 1 Chron. xxiii. 24, 27; 2 Chron. xxxi. 17-19. The reference to the oversight of the works presupposes the statement in v. 57 which is wanting in MT. E v. 9 is very confused and the names of the Levites are severed; E has doublets, and Jos. § 79 points to the reading 'Kadmiel the brother of Judah (= Hodaviah, E ii. 40) the son of Amminadab'; see Bayer, 64 seq. Meyer observes that the Levites of Henadad (wanting in the preceding register) apparently were not of exilic origin; see on v. 26.

of the Lord. Then stood up Jesus, and his sons and brethren, and Kadmiel his brother, and the sons of Jesus, Emadabun, and the sons of Joda the son of Iliadun, and their sons and brethren, all the Levites, with one accord set forward of the business, labouring to advance the works in the house of God. So the builders builded
 59 the temple of the Lord. And the priests stood arrayed in their vestments with musical instruments and trumpets, and the Levites the sons
 60 of Asaph with their cymbals, singing songs of thanksgiving, and praising the Lord, after the
 61 order of David king of Israel. And they sang aloud, praising the Lord in songs of thanksgiving, because his goodness and his glory are
 62 for ever in all Israel. And all the people sounded trumpets, and shouted with a loud voice, singing songs of thanksgiving unto the
 63 Lord for the rearing up of the house of the Lord. Also of the priests the Levites, and of
 the heads of their families, the ancients who had seen the former house came to the building of this with lamentation and great weeping.
 64 But many with trumpets and joy *shouted* with
 65 loud voice, insomuch that the people heard not the trumpets for the weeping of the people: for the multitude sounded marvellously, so that it was heard afar off.
 66 Wherefore when the enemies of the tribe of Judah and Benjamin heard it, they came to know what that noise of trumpets should mean.
 67 And they perceived that they that were of the captivity did build the temple unto the Lord, the God of Israel. So they went to Zerubbabel and Jesus, and to the chief men of the families, and said unto them, We will build together
 68 with you. For we likewise, as ye, do obey your Lord, and do sacrifice unto him from the

sight of the work of the house of the Lord. Then 9 stood Jeshua with his sons and his brethren, Kadmiel and his sons, the sons of Judah, together, to have the oversight of the workmen in the house of God: the sons of Henadad, with their sons and their brethren the Levites.

And 10 when the builders laid the foundation of the temple of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites the sons of Asaph with cymbals, to praise the Lord, after the order of David king of Israel.

And they 11 sang one to another in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord, *saying*, For he is good, for his mercy *endureth* for ever toward Israel. And all the people shouted with a great shout, when they praised the Lord, because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid.

But many of the 12 priests and Levites and heads of fathers' *houses*, the old men that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice; and many shouted aloud for joy: so that the people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people: for the people shouted with a loud shout, and the noise was heard afar off.

Now when the adversaries of Judah and 13 Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded a temple unto the Lord, the God of Israel;

then they drew near to Zerubbabel, 2 and to the heads of fathers' *houses*, and said unto them, Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon king of

59. stood, so G and some MSS. of the MT.

61. For the refrain see 2 Chron. v. 13, and especially Jer. xxxiii. 10 seq., a prophecy of the repopulating of the desert land (cf. v. 7 seq.), which is followed by the promise of the ideal king (v. 14-18).

62. sounded, shouted, apparently doublets of שָׁרְרָה; cf. v. 64 seq.

63. came (i.e. בָּאוּ), but MT *many* (בָּאוּ) is wanting.

the former house . . ., E.R.V. mg. *the first house standing on its foundation, when this house was before their eyes*; cf. Hagg. ii. 3 (Darius). For the mingling of joy and sorrow cf. E ix. 50-4, and for the last words of v. 65, cf. Neh. xii. 43.

The Samaritan opposition. v. 66-73 = E iv. 1-5, 24; cf. Jos. xi. 4 3-4, §§ 84-8. The result of the opposition indicates that there could have been no large return of exiles fortified with the decree of a generous king. Jos. (xi. 2 1), and many modern scholars attempt to explain the success of the opponents, but the Sachau-papyri from Elephantine prove that, whatever may have been the case with Cyrus, Cambyses was ready to assist the Jews. Moreover, Haggai and Zechariah do not refer to any persisting opposition of the kind here implied, and, according to the former, when the Temple was ultimately taken in hand in the reign of Darius, not external history, but the desire to remove the distress caused by the failure of the rains was the main factor. The term 'enemies' (v. 66) is applied prospectively (Reuss), and, as Ewald (1105 n. 4) remarks, 'this severe designation only belongs to the later period in which the mutual hostility of the neighbours on either side had quite broken out.' In fact the situation in 66 seqq. has many untrustworthy features (so even Meyer, 119 seqq., 124 seqq.; Cornill, *Introd.* 252), and the proposal of Rothstein (15, 20) to ascribe 47-53 and 56-73 a to the reigns of Cyrus and Darius respectively, though insufficient in itself, illustrates the difficulties. Indeed, all the indications point to an initial absence of Samaritan hostility (see Davies, 81), and there are some striking resemblances between the details here and in N ii., iv., vi., the relation between v. 68 seq. and N ii. 20 being especially interesting. See *Introd.* § 5 a, b, c (end).

days of Asbasareth the king of the Assyrians,
70 who brought us hither. Then Zerobabel and
Jesus and the chief men of the families of Israel
said unto them, It is not for you to build the
71 house unto the Lord our God. We ourselves
alone will build unto the Lord of Israel, accord-
ing as Cyrus the king of the Persians hath
72 commanded us. But the heathen of the land
lying heavy upon the inhabitants of Judaea, and
holding them strait, hindered their building;
73 and by their secret plots, and popular persuasions
and commotions, they hindered the finishing of
the building all the time that king Cyrus lived:

so they were hindered from building for the
space of two years, until the reign of Darius.

6.1 Now in the second year of the reign of Darius,
Aggeus and Zacharias the son of Addo, the

Assyria, which brought us up hither.

But Zerub-
3 babel, and Jeshua, and the rest of the heads of
fathers' houses of Israel, said unto them, Ye have
nothing to do with us to build an house unto our
God; but we ourselves together will build unto
the Lord, the God of Israel, as king Cyrus the
king of Persia hath commanded us. Then the 4
people of the land weakened the hands of
the people of Judah, and troubled them in
building, and hired counsellors against them, 5
to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus
king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius
king of Persia.

Then ceased the work of the 24
house of God which is at Jerusalem; and it
ceased unto the second year of the reign of
Darius king of Persia.

Now the prophets, Haggai the prophet, and 5.1
Zechariah the son of Iddo, prophesied unto the

69. **Asbasareth** (C^a), mg. *Asbacaphath* (B and partly S), but L *αγορῶν*; see Torrey, 169 n. Jos. has Shalmaneser (cf. E iv. 10 C^a and Tobit i.); he ascribes the origin of the Samaritans to Cutha and Media (§ 85, cf. § 19), and, in his version of E. 71 (where Cyrus and Darius are associated), allows them and other peoples to come to Jerusalem for worship (similarly xviii. 22).

70. **for you**, mg. *for us and you* (C^a, S).

71. **alone**; E *together*, which would be more appropriate in E iv. 2. For the spirit of the reply, cf. Neh. ii. 20 and see 2 Chron. xiii. 5-12, xxv. 7, and 2 Kings xvii. 7-41, xviii. 12.

72 seq. **lying heavy**, *ἐπιβαρύνοντες* (B^a), *ἐπιβαρύνοντες* (L), *gentes autem terrae quae commixtae erant* (L), 'that were set over them' (S). Fr. conj. *ἐπιτιμῶντες*.

holding them strait (*κατασκευάζοντες*), mg. *besieging them*.

by their secret plots, &c., mg. *leading the people astray in counsel and raising commotions*; *καὶ δοῦναι (ἐνοουδίας, A) καὶ δημιουργήσαντες* (-αε, B^{ab}); *δημιουργίας*, AL) *καὶ ἐνοουδίας (ἐνοουδίας, L) ποιήσαντες*. See further, Moulton, ZATW, xx. 1 seq. The language (E v. 4 seq.) implies that the Jews were slandered at the Persian court (Ryle, Bertholet); the whole situation is illustrated by Neh. ii. 19 seq., iv., vi.

73. **for the space of two years**; the MT is correctly reproduced in E ii. 30; see *Introd.*, p. 17 v. Jos. (§ 89), who has filled in the gap between E ii. 15 and 16 (§ 19) and consistently placed E v. in the reign of Darius (who carries out the wish of Cyrus), refers to the new opposition (as in the days of Cyrus and Cambyses), ignores the actual cessation and the fresh 'beginning' (E vi. 2), and passes on to the visit of Tattenai.

The rebuilding and completion of the Temple in the reign of Darius. vi.-vii. = E v.-vi., cf. Jos. xi. 4. 1-8, whose treatment of the material is highly instructive. (a) In MT the narrative, apart from E vi. 19-22, is like E iv. 8-24, in Aramaic, and the dialect, though in close agreement with Eg.-Aram. papyri of the fifth cent., is certainly later: see Bevan, *Daniel*, 34; T. Noldeke, *Ency. Brill*, xxiv. 624; A. Kamphausen, *ib.* 1010 n. 1; Driver, *Lib.* 504, 515; Torrey, 164 seqq. The excerpts show some traces of Jewish colouring and of compilation and adjustment (see E vi. 8, 18, 23, 26, 33), and the whole concludes with an account, in the chronicler's style, of the dedication of the Temple. To what extent reshaping and revision have been effected is of course uncertain (see Torrey, 142 seqq.). E is especially noteworthy for its doublets (vi. 5, 10, 12, 15, 28, see further Marq. 44 seq.), perplexing paraphrases (e.g. vi. 19 seq., 26 seqq.), and for a few interesting material variations (see vi. 4, 18, 26 seq., 32, vii. 1 seq., 5 seq., 9).

(b) The narrative represents a zealous satrap anxious to ascertain whether the Jews had really received permission from Cyrus to rebuild the temple. His procedure is quite formal (cf. E iv. 8 seqq., contrast N. iv., vi.), and Darius, having found the 'memorandum' of Cyrus, not only confirms that king's permission, but goes further in his benevolence. Such a representation agrees with the traditional friendliness of Darius (see also vi. 26), but utterly conflicts with his own decree already given in E iv. The wording does not suggest that the Jews, whether before or after the intervention of Darius, were rewarded for any act of loyalty, e.g. abstinence from the intrigues at his succession. Nor does it point to any serious Samaritan hostility (see Kesters, *Th. T.* xxxi. 545 seq.; Meyer, 124; Sellin, *Ser.* 88). In thus agreeing with Hag. and Zech. it also does not state that the Jewish builders were exiles from Babylon (Kesters, 26; contrast the explicit E iv. 12; see on E vi. 5, 18). Both sources agree, moreover, in dating the founding of the Temple in the second year of Darius (see on vi. 1 seq.), and this narrative, implying that the building was in course of erection, might be taken to refer to a slightly later date.

(c) It throws another light upon the decree of Cyrus (vi. 17-20, 24-26, see ii. 1 seqq.). It confirms the return of the vessels (contrast iv. 44, 57), but gives prominence to Sheshbazzar (cf. E i.) and not to Zerubbabel (E iii., see on E vi. 18 seq.). These two are identified by harmonists (see 18, 27, 29), but to the latter alone do the independent prophecies ascribe the commencement and completion of the Temple (see *Introd.* § 4, 11). In addition to this, while vi. 1 seq. relate the 'beginning' by Zer. and Jeshua, the context combines the representation of *continuous* operations since the return of Sheshbazzar (E v. 16) with a complete cessation (iv. 24) which is attributed to the decree of a Persian king. See further *Introd.* § 6. On the text, see also Torrey, 189 seqq., 201 seqq.

1 seq. The opening verses agree with Hag. in the date of the beginning of the building, yet not 'before a stone was laid upon a stone' (Hag. ii. 15), but after a complete cessation (E iv. 24); contrast, however, v. 20 below.

Addo, mg. *Eidin* (C^a). A priest Zechariah son of Iddo is mentioned in the time of Joiakim the son of Jeshua

prophets, prophesied unto the Jews in Jewry and Jerusalem; in the name of the Lord, the
 2 God of Israel, *prophesied they* unto them. Then stood up Zerobabel the son of Salathiel, and Jesus the son of Josedek, and began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, the prophets of the Lord being with them, *and helping them.*

3 At the same time came unto them Sisinnus the governor of Syria and Phœnicia, with Sathrabuzanes and his companions, and said unto them,
 4 By whose appointment do ye build this house and this roof, and perform all the other things? and who are the builders that perform these things?

5 Nevertheless the elders of the Jews obtained favour, because the Lord had visited
 6 the captivity; and they were not hindered from building, until such time as communication was made unto Darius concerning them, and his answer signified.

7 The copy of the letter which Sisinnus, governor of Syria and Phœnicia, and Sathrabuzanes, with their companions, the rulers in Syria and Phœnicia, wrote and sent unto Darius;

8 To king Darius, greeting: Let all things be known unto our lord the king, that being come into the country of Judæa, and entered into the city of Jerusalem, we found in the city of Jerusalem the elders of
 9 the Jews that were of the captivity building a house unto the Lord, great *and* new, of hewn
 10 and costly stones, with timber laid in the walls. And those works are done with great speed, and the work goeth on prosperously in their hands, and with all glory and diligence is it accom-

Jews that were in Judah and Jerusalem; in the name of the God of Israel *prophesied they* unto them. Then rose up Zerubbabel the son of² Shealtiel, and Jeshua the son of Jozadak, and began to build the house of God which is at Jerusalem; and with them were the prophets of God, helping them.

At the same time came to³ them Tattenai, the governor beyond the river, and Shethar-bozenai, and their companions, and said thus unto them, Who gave you a decree to build this house, and to finish this wall?

Then⁴ spake we unto them after this manner, What are the names of the men that make this building? But the eye of their God was upon the elders of⁵ the Jews, and they did not make them cease, till the matter should come to Darius, and then answer should be returned by letter concerning it.

The copy of the letter that Tattenai, the⁶ governor beyond the river, and Shethar-bozenai, and his companions the Apharsachites, which were beyond the river, sent unto Darius the king: they sent a letter unto him, wherein was⁷ written thus; Unto Darius the king, all peace. Be it known unto the king, that we went into⁸ the province of Judah,

to the house of the great God, which is builded with great stones, and timber is laid in the walls, and this work goeth on with diligence and prospereth in their hands.

(N. xii. 16); but the family of Iddo, though among the priests in N. xii. 4, is not named in the great list (E ii., &c.). Did the four families in E ii. 35-9 suddenly expand into the twenty-two in Neh. xii. 1-7 or the twenty-four in 1 Chron. xxiv., or were the latter incorporated into four great classes? On the traditional view some explanation is necessary.

unto them (*et' airois*), E, R.V. mg. *which was upon them*, cf. Jer. xv. 16.

3. On the identification of the names (Ustani, a prefect of Transpotamia temp. Darius, or Taddanu a Bab. name; and Mithrabuzanes, or perhaps Satibarzanes), see the comment, and Torrey, 172. E's Sisinnus, though probably incorrect, is a thoroughly authentic name and typical of the cleverness of the translator.

his (E. *their*) companions. On the variation in the possessive pronoun, see Guthe, *SBOT*.

4. roof, E wall, אֲרָצָה (*ἄρχαία*, 'charges' in E iv. 54 seq.). The readings represent (so Torrey, 175 seq.) אֲרָצָה (*iggara* 'roof', *agra* 'pay'), cf. אֲרָצָה 'shrine, temple', in the Aram. papyri from Egypt (Sayce and Cowley, E 14 J 6, Sachau I, 6, &c.). אֲרָצָה, also in Sachau I, 11, denotes some part of a temple, whether fore-court (Sach.), colonnade (Torrey), or the temple as a whole (see Haupt, Delitzsch, *SBOT*; 34, 63, Nickel 130 n. 2, Jampel i. 494). Jos. (§ 89) finds a reference to the porticoes (*stoa*i, see on vii. 9) and the walls of the city. Was אֲרָצָה altered in MT because of its heathen associations? Cf. its use in the Targums of a heathen altar, and the Bab. *ekur*; cf. also the distinction observed in MT between אֲרָצָה and אֲרָצָה.

and who. E 'then spake we' (E S 'then spake they'), an actual quotation from the report, cf. ib. 9 seq.

5. the captivity (cf. E S), and see *pro.* 8, 27 seq.; based upon a doublet אֲרָצָה 'elders [of]' and אֲרָצָה 'captivity'.

7. E 'The copy of the letter which he (E 'they') wrote unto D. and sent: Sis., the governor, &c., to king Darius greeting' (cf. E).

7 seq. Let all things . . . E combines this with the reading of E.

our lord the king, rightly, cf. 21 seq., ii. 17 seq.

The reference to the arrival at Jerusalem and the discovery is quite appropriate (Marq., 46 seq.); MT has apparently condensed.

9. new, apparently based upon *v.* 25, where it represents MT אֲרָצָה an error for אֲרָצָה 'one'; the doublet combines both corrigendum and correctum (see Berth. xvi. seq., 24).

11 plished. Then asked we these elders, saying,
By whose commandment build ye this house,
12 and lay the foundations of these works? There-
fore, to the intent that we might give knowledge
unto thee by writing who were the chief doers,
we questioned them, and we required of them
13 the names in writing of their principal men. So
they gave us this answer, We are the servants of
14 the Lord which made heaven and earth. And
as for this house, it was builded many years ago
by a king of Israel great and strong, and was
15 finished. But when our fathers sinned against
the Lord of Israel which is in heaven, and pro-
voked him unto wrath, he gave them over into
the hands of Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon,
16 king of the Chaldeans; and they pulled down
the house, and burned it, and carried away the
17 people captives unto Babylon. But in the first
year that Cyrus reigned over the country of
Babylon, king Cyrus wrote to build up this
18 house. And the holy vessels of gold and of
silver, that Nabuchodonosor had carried away
out of the house at Jerusalem, and had set up in
his own temple, those Cyrus the king brought
forth again out of the temple in Babylonia, and
they were delivered to Zorobabel and to Sana-
bassarus the governor.

19 with commandment that
he should carry away all these vessels, and put
them in the temple at Jerusalem; and that the
temple of the Lord should be built in its place.
20 Then Sanabassarus, being come hither, laid the
foundations of the house of the Lord which is in
Jerusalem; and from that time to this being still
a-building, it is not yet fully ended.

21 Now there-
fore, if it seem good, O king, let search be made
among the royal archives of our lord the king
22 that are in Babylon: and if it be found that the
building of the house of the Lord which is in
Jerusalem hath been done with the consent of
king Cyrus, and it seem good unto our lord the
king, let him signify unto us thereof.

23 Then commanded king Darius to seek among
the archives that were laid up at Babylon:

and

Then asked we those elders, and said unto them 9
thus, Who gave you a decree to build this house,
and to finish this wall? We asked them their
10 names also, to certify thee, that we might write
the names of the men that were at the head of
them.

And thus they returned us answer, say- 11
ing, We are the servants of the God of heaven
and earth, and build the house that was builded
these many years ago, which a great king of
Israel builded and finished.

But after that our 12
fathers had provoked the God of heaven unto
wrath, he gave them into the hand of Nebuchad-
nezzar king of Babylon, the Chaldean, who
destroyed this house, and carried the people away
into Babylon.

But in the first year of Cyrus 13
king of Babylon, Cyrus the king made a decree to
build this house of God.

And the gold and 14
silver vessels also of the house of God, which
Nebuchadnezzar took out of the temple that
was in Jerusalem, and brought them into the
temple of Babylon, those did Cyrus the king
take out of the temple of Babylon, and they
were delivered unto one whose name was Shesh-
bazzar, whom he had made governor; and he 15
said unto him, Take these vessels, go, put them
in the temple that is in Jerusalem, and let the
house of God be builded in its place.

Then 16
came the same Sheshbazzar, and laid the founda-
tions of the house of God which is in Jerusalem:
and since that time even until now hath it been
in building, and yet it is not completed. Now 17
therefore, if it seem good to the king, let there be
search made in the king's treasure house, which
is there at Babylon, whether it be so, that
a decree was made of Cyrus the king to build
this house of God at Jerusalem, and let the king
send his pleasure to us concerning this matter.

EZRA 6

Then Darius the king made a decree, and 1
search was made in the house of the archives,
where the treasures were laid up in Babylon.
And there was found at Achmetha, in the palace 2

13. the Lord which made (*τὸν κτίσαντος*), cf. 2 Chron. ii. 12 (*ἐποίησεν*) and the quotation in Eupolemos (*ἔκτισεν*), second cent. B.C. (Swete, *Introd.* 370; Torrey, 82); also Jer. x. 11 and the late Gen. xiv. 19 R.V. mg.

15. Lord . . . heaven. A conflate reading.

Note that even the Aram. source presents the later and inaccurate form of the name Nebuchadnezzar.

18. his own temple, cf. ii. 10.

and to Sanabassarus (mg. *Sanabassarus*). Some MSS. omit *and*; this *and* the sequel ('that he should carry') indicate that the attempt has been made to identify Sheshbazzar (E. i.) with the more prominent Zerubbabel (Nikel, 42 n. 1, 45). Note the introduction of the latter in *vzz.* 27, 29.

E 'whom he had made' . . . , but *ἔβα* 'to the treasurer . . . who was over the treasury'. This must refer not to Shesh., but to Mithredath (E i. 8) whom Jos. combines with Zer. here (§ 92, cf. ib. xi. 3 §§ 11, 14), although in his version of E 20, 26, he mentions only Shesh. The allusion to the treasury may be supported by E v. 17, vi. 1. That the texts are not in their original form is obvious.

19. all these vessels, mg. *the same* (*ἑ*).

21. of our lord (*Κυρίου*), *ἑ* S, curiously 'of Cyrus' (so A.V.).

so at Ecbatana the palace, which is in the country of Media, there was found a roll where-
 24 in these things were recorded. In the first year of the reign of Cyrus king Cyrus commanded to build up the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem, where they do sacrifice
 25 with continual fire: whose height shall be sixty cubits, and the breadth sixty cubits,

with three rows of hewn stones, and one row of new wood of that country; and the expenses thereof to
 26 be given out of the house of king Cyrus: and that the holy vessels of the house of the Lord, both of gold and silver, that Nabuchodonosor took out of the house at Jerusalem, and carried away to Babylon, should be restored to the house at Jerusalem, and be set in the place where they were before.

27 And also he commanded that Sisinnus the governor of Syria and Phœnicia, and Sathrabuzanes, and their companions, and those which were appointed rulers in Syria and Phœnicia, should be careful not to meddle with the place, but suffer Zorobabel, the servant of the Lord, and governor of Judæa, and the elders of the Jews, to build that
 28 house of the Lord in its place. And I also do command to have it built up whole again; and that they look diligently to help those that be of the captivity of Judæa, till the house of the
 29 Lord be finished: and that out of the tribute of Cœlesyria and Phœnicia a portion be carefully given these men for the sacrifices of the Lord, that is, to Zorobabel the governor, for bullocks,
 30 and rams, and lambs; and also corn, salt, wine, and oil, and that continually every year without further question, according as the priests that be in Jerusalem shall signify to be daily spent:

that is in the province of Media, a roll, and therein was thus written for a record.

In the 3 first year of Cyrus the king, Cyrus the king made a decree; Concerning the house of God at Jerusalem, let the house be builded, the place where they offer sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof threescore cubits; with three rows of great stones,
 4 and a row of new timber: and let the expenses be given out of the king's house:

and also let 5 the gold and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took forth out of the temple which is at Jerusalem, and brought unto Babylon, be restored, and brought again unto the temple which is at Jerusalem, every one to its place, and thou shalt put them in the house of God. Now therefore, Tattenai, governor beyond 6 the river, Shethar-bozenai, and your companions the Apharsachites, which are beyond the river, be ye far from thence:

let the work of this house 7 of God alone; let the governor of the Jews and the elders of the Jews build this house of God in its place. Moreover I make a decree what ye 8 shall do to these elders of the Jews for the building of this house of God:

that of the king's goods, even of the tribute beyond the river, expenses be given with all diligence unto these men, that they be not hindered. And that 9 which they have need of, both young bullocks, and rams, and lambs, for burnt offerings to the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, and oil, according to the word of the priests which are

23. roll (G^a, Jos.), mg. *placit* (G^a L S), a confusion of *τόπος* and *ρόμος*. The 'memorandum' (דברון) recalls the זכרון (Sach. Pap. III) relating to the rebuilding of the Jewish sanctuary at Elephantine. The fact that the roll was sought for at Babylon but found at Ecbatana points to some condensation in the narrative.

24. continual fire. A slight change of the MT supported by most scholars.

25. Jos. (§ 99) applies these measurements to the altar, although in xi. 1 3 (see below on v. 26) he rightly refers them to the Temple.

one row of new wood (similarly Jos.) of that country, 'one' and 'new' are doublets, (see v. 9), and 'country' seems to be some confusion of the Heb. ארץ (land) and אֲרָז (cedar), so Jahn; or of the Aram. ארע (land) and אֵט (wood), so Marg. For the details see I Kings vi. 36, vii. 12.

26. Note the changes of person and number in MT (E 6 has *their* companions). The compiler turns the decree of Cyrus into a command to Shesh. (*and thou shalt place*), and then passes on to the commands of Darius (see Meyer, 47); a clear case of compilation. E, however, takes E 6 to belong to the old decree, and Jos. actually attributes the whole (to the end of v. 35) to Cyrus, which Darius (as in v. 34) simply endorses. Hence, in his history of Cyrus, Jos. (xi. 1 3) gives a lengthy decree on these lines in the form of a letter to Tattenai and Shethar-bozenai, an interesting and instructive example of history-making.

27. the servant of the Lord. Jos. (§ 101) 'the servants of God (cf. v. 13), the Jews and their leaders'. Here and in v. 29 Zer. appears to be due to later insertion (Jos. omits); perhaps the translator misunderstood עֲבִירָה ('work') in the MT, where G^a om. 'the governor (G^a governors, or leaders) of the Jews and'. In E v. 5, 9, vi. 8, 14 only the 'elders of the Jews' are mentioned: see Guthe, *SBOT*.

28. till . . . finished, a natural limitation, cf. iv. 51, and the stipulation in N ii. 6; with MT cf. the free hand given to Ezra (E vii.).

29. of the Lord . . . cf. S: G ἑνὶ ἑσθῆρι (G^a + rovi, cf. Dan. vi. 26, Bel and Dragon, 41) Zep. ἐν ἑσθῆρι (G^a om.).

30. question, a misunderstanding (as in E G) of שָׁלַח, as though from שָׁלַח.

31 that drink offerings may be made to the Most High God for the king and for his children, and that they may pray for their lives.

32 And that commandment be given that whosoever shall transgress, yea, or neglect anything *herein* written, out of his own house shall a tree be taken, and he thereon be hanged, and all his goods seized for the king. The Lord therefore, whose name is there called upon, utterly destroy every king and nation, that shall stretch out his hand to hinder or endamage that house of the Lord in Jerusalem. I Darius the king have ordained that according unto these things it be done with diligence.

7¹ Then Sisinnes the governor of Coelesyria and Phœnicia, and Sathrabuzanes, with their companions, following the commandments of king 2 Darius, did very carefully oversee the holy works, assisting the elders of the Jews and rulers of the 3 temple. And so the holy works prospered, while Aggaeus and Zacharias the prophets prophesied.

4 And they finished these things by the commandment of the Lord, the God of Israel, and with the consent of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes, kings 5 of the Persians. *And thus* was the house finished by the three and twentieth day of the month 6 Adar, in the sixth year of king Darius. And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the other that were of the captivity, that were added *unto them*, did according to the things 7 *written* in the book of Moses. And to the dedication of the temple of the Lord they offered a hundred bullocks, two hundred rams, four hun-

at Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day without fail: that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savour unto the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king, and of his sons.

Also I have made a decree, that whosoever shall alter this word, let a beam be pulled out from his house, and let him be lifted up and fastened thereon; and let his house be made a dunghill for this:

and the God that hath caused his name to dwell there overthrow all kings and peoples, that shall put forth their hand to alter *the same*, to destroy this house of God which is at Jerusalem. I Darius have made a decree; let it be done with all diligence.

Then Tattenai, the governor beyond the river, 13 Shethar-bozenai, and their companions, because that Darius the king had sent, did accordingly with all diligence.

And the elders of the Jews 14 builded and prospered, through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they builded and finished it, according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the decree of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia. And this house 15 was finished on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king.

And the children of Israel, the 16 priests and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of this house of God with joy.

And they offered 17 at the dedication of this house of God an hundred bullocks, two hundred rams, four hun-

31. For the praying cf. Baruch i. 10 seq., 1 Macc. vii. 33, Sach. Pap. I, 25 seq. \mathfrak{C}^2 reads *θυσία κ. προσβαί* and adds *ἰσχυροῦς* at end of verse.

32. *written*, mg. *afore spoken or written* (\mathfrak{C}^b).

goods seized, similarly Jos.; cf. Dan. ii. 5, iii. 29, \mathfrak{C} . This interpretation of MT לָקַח (לָקַח) 'dunghill' is supported by Jahn (55) and by Torrey (85, who compares Ar. *nāla* 'take, obtain'). Bayer, 30, emends.

33. *therefore*, MT *for this*, end of v. 11.

whose name . . . , the Jewish colouring in this verse (cf. Deut. xii. 11, xiv. 23) is commonly admitted (Meyer, 51, Holzhey, 25, &c.).

VII. 1 seq. The more active intervention of the strangers (*ἑπιστάται* . . . *ἐπιμελήσαντες*), though in harmony with viii. 67 (E viii. 36), is less emphatic in MT ' . . . their companions did according to the decree which . . . sent', cf. above, 27 seq., with E vi. 7.

2. *rulers of the temple* (*ἑπιστάται*: Jos. 'princes of the Sanhedrin'), cf. i. 8 (2 Chron. xxxv. 8), and the addition in $\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{C}$ 'and the Levites'.

4. *consent* (A.V. mg. *the decree, γνώμη*) . . . *Artaxerxes* (Jos. omits Art., \mathfrak{C}^b transposes with Darius), *kings* (\mathfrak{C}^2 and MT *king*) . . . The name can hardly be explained even as a careless interpolation; the reading *king* suggests that only one name was originally written; see *Introd.* § 5 (c).

\mathfrak{C}^b , \mathfrak{S} , \mathfrak{L} add 'until (by) the sixth year of Darius king of the Persians'.

5. *the house*, mg. *the holy house* (\mathfrak{C}^b).

Jos. confirms the 23rd day (adopted by Bertholet, Torrey, 195, but treated by Bayer, 83, as a misreading, $\text{לַיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי}$ for $\text{לַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי}$), but reads the *ninth* year of Darius; in *C. Apion.* i. 21 he states that the foundations of the Temple were laid in the second year of Cyrus and it was finished again in the *second* year of Darius.

6. *that were added*, explained by v. 13, although this act of separation is not recorded, contrast N ix. 2, xiii. 3 (see below, p. 47).

book of Moses, cf. v. 49, and especially N. viii. 1, x. 29, xiii. 1.

- 8 dred lambs; and twelve he-goats for the sin of all Israel, according to the number of the twelve princes of the tribes of Israel. The priests also and the Levites stood arrayed in their vestments, according to their kindreds, for the services of the Lord, the God of Israel, according to the book of Moses: and the porters at every gate.
- 10 And the children of Israel that came out of the captivity held the passover the fourteenth day of the first month, when the priests and the Levites were sanctified together, and all they that were of the captivity; for they were sanctified.
- 11 For the Levites were all sanctified together, and they offered the passover for all them of the captivity, and for their brethren the priests, and for themselves. And the children of Israel that came out of the captivity did eat, even all they that had separated themselves from the abominations of the heathen of the land, and sought the Lord.
- 14 And they kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days, making merry before the Lord, for that he had turned the counsel of the king of Assyria toward them, to strengthen their hands in the works of the Lord, the God of Israel.
- 81 And after these things, when Artaxerxes the king of the Persians reigned, came Esdras the

dred lambs; and for a sin offering for all Israel, twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel. And they set the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of God, which is at Jerusalem; as it is written in the book of Moses.

And the children of the captivity kept the passover upon the fourteenth day of the first month. For the priests and the Levites had purified themselves together; all of them were pure: and they killed the passover for all the children of the captivity, and for their brethren the priests, and for themselves.

And the children of Israel, which were come again out of the captivity, and all such as had separated themselves unto them from the filthiness of the heathen of the land, to seek the Lord, the God of Israel, did eat, and kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with joy: for the Lord had made them joyful, and had turned the heart of the king of Assyria unto them, to strengthen their hands in the work of the house of God, the God of Israel.

Now after these things, in the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, Ezra the son of Seraiah, the

8. **princes**, mg. *twelve tribes of Israel* (G¹).

9. Cf. v. 59. For the *porters* (also in Jos.), cf. i. 16, and 2 Chron. viii. 14, xxiii. 18 seq.; Jos. adds that the Jews also built the cloisters (*oroi*) of the inner temple. See vi. 4 above.

10. From this verse onwards the MT, with the exception of E vii. 12-26, is in Hebrew. With this account of the celebration of the Passover, cf. 2 Chron. xxx. (after the purification of the Temple by Hezekiah), xxxv. = E 1 (after Josiah's reforms); see also p. 58.

of Israel, lit. 'of Israel, of those that were of the captivity.'

when the priests, several MSS. because.

11 seq. mg. and they that were of the captivity were not all sanctified together: but the Levites were all sanctified together. And, etc.; cf. G¹ L S, but not Jos. For the textual variants see ZATW, xx. 12 seq. Since the Levites perform the slaughtering there may be an anti-Aaronite bias, as also in 2 Chron. xxix. 34 (cf. perhaps xxx. 3, 15 17); see Kittel, *Chron.* 160.

13. **even**, wanting in G.

15. Jos. (§§ 111-13) after summing up with an account of the constitution, &c., appends (§§ 114-19) a new story of Samaritan enmity and of the intervention of Darius. The Jews send Zerubbabel and four nobles, including Ananias and Mordecai (see for the latter, v. 8 above) to complain that the Samaritans did not carry out the royal commands and were hostile. Darius accordingly writes to the eparchs and council (*βασιλῆς*, cf. ii. 17), viz. to Taganas and Sambas (or Sambabas), the eparchs, and to Sadrales and Bouedôn (var. Bouclôn, &c.), 'the rest of their fellow servants' (*συνδούλοι*, cf. G¹ E. v. seq. for 'companions'). On the conjectural origin of these corrupt names, see Marq. 52, 54 (Tag. from Tattenai, Sad. and Bou. from Shethar-bozenai).

The Work of Ezra. (a) The narratives are severed in the MT, which places E vii.-x. (E viii. 1-ix. 36) in the seventh year of Artaxerxes (458 B.C.), and N viii. seq. (E ix. 37-55 + . . .) in the twentieth. They are of composite origin: note the introductory impersonal E vii. 1-10 (see Driver, *Lit.*, 548 seq.), the change from 'I' (vii. 27-ix.) to the impersonal form in viii. 35 seq., the use of 'I' (ix.), 'he' (x.), and 'we' (N ix. 38, x. 30). In spite of parallels (Torrey, 244 seq.), these changes seem to prove diversity of source. Various signs of revision and condensation are to be noticed in vii. (see E viii. 8-24), x. (Meyer, 96 n. 1), and elsewhere.

(b) Although N viii. seq. interrupt the history of Neh., and both E and N are engaged in reorganizing religious conditions, the story of N ignores the work of E, and the story of E mentions N only somewhat incidentally (N viii. 9, x. 1). The two groups of narratives have different backgrounds. The E-story shows no trace of the desolation and misery which N sought to remedy. E is intent upon the Temple and the law, and comes to an apparently peaceful city, whereas N appears as a reformer of elementary civic, social, and religious conditions at a time when E was presumably in Jerusalem. The secular pioneer builds up and reconstructs; the priestly scribe gives, as it were, a finishing stroke in the way of important, though less initial, reforms. While N laments the ruin and distress, E recognizes the manifestation of God's favour, which the people had ill requited by their heathenish marriages. The former encounters suspicion, hostility, and treachery; the latter, armed with most remarkable powers, finds a people anxious to hear and obey the law, eager to remove the stain of the marriages, and ready to carry out measures which N, with characteristic impulsiveness, seems merely to initiate in N xiii. The whole situation in the E-story forbids

son of Azariai, the son of Zechrias, the son of
 2 Helkias, the son of Salem, the son of Sadduk,
 the son of Ahitob,

the son of Amarias, the son
 of Ozias, the son of Memeroth, the son of
 Zariai, the son of Savias, the son of Boccas,
 the son of Abisue, the son of Phinees, the son
 of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the chief priest.

3 This Esdras went up from Babylon, as being
 a ready scribe in the law of Moses, that was
 4 given by the God of Israel. And the king did
 him honour: for he found grace in his sight in
 all his requests.

5 There went up with him also
 certain of the children of Israel, and of the priests,
 and Levites, and holy singers, and porters, and
 6 temple-servants, unto Jerusalem, in the seventh
 year of the reign of Artaxerxes, in the fifth
 month, this was the king's seventh year;

for they
 went from Babylon on the new moon of the first
 month, and came to Jerusalem, according to the
 prosperous journey which the Lord gave them
 7 for his sake. For Esdras had very great skill, so
 that he omitted nothing of the law and command-
 ments of the Lord, but taught all Israel the ordi-
 nances and judgements.

son of Azariah,

the son of Hilkiah, the son of 2
 Shallum, the son of Zadok, the son of Ahitub,
 the son of Amariah, the son of Azariah, the son 3
 of Meraioth, the son of Zerahiah, the son of Uzzi, 4
 the son of Bukki, the son of Abishua, the son of 5
 Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron
 the chief priest:

this Ezra went up from Baby- 6
 lon; and he was a ready scribe in the law of
 Moses, which the Lord, the God of Israel, had
 given: and the king granted him all his request,
 according to the hand of the Lord his God upon
 him. And there went up some of the children 7
 of Israel, and of the priests, and the Levites, and
 the singers, and the porters, and the Nethinim,
 unto Jerusalem, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes
 the king. And he came to Jerusalem in 8
 the fifth month, which was in the seventh year
 of the king. For upon the first day of the first 9
 month began he to go up from Babylon, and on
 the first day of the fifth month came he to Jeru-
 salem, according to the good hand of his God
 upon him. For Ezra had set his heart to seek 10
 the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach
 in Israel statutes and judgements.

the identification of E's return with that in E iv. 12 (E ii, 18). The rebuilding mentioned in the latter is excluded in the E-story and ignored in N i.-vi., where there is neither any reference to an earlier attempt to rebuild nor any hint of such a return as that in E vii.-x.

(c) E vii.-x. are severed from E i.-vi. by nearly sixty years. A large body of exiles, 'children of the captivity' (iv. 1), had rejected the families of doubtful blood (ii. 59-63), and had been reinforced by those who had separated from the heathen (vi. 21). Jewish exclusivism had apparently been established. Now, however, E returns with a representative band (vii. 7), 'children of the captivity' (viii. 35), and, after an interval (the vague ix. 1), hears of the deplorable extent of intermarriage among the people of Israel, the 'holy seed' (ix. 2), 'the captivity' (ix. 4). The sin is admitted, and it is proposed to make a solemn covenant (x. 3). 'The children of the captivity' are summoned from their settlements under the penalty of excommunication from 'the congregation of the captivity' (x. 6-8). The area affected proves to be extremely restricted (x. 9). The congregation agrees to the separation (xv. 10-12). There is, however, an inquiry lasting three months, and as a veritable anti-climax we have an extremely small list of offenders (see on E ix. 21-36). Forthwith (so E), or apparently some twelve years later (so N viii.), E reads the law to the people, and 'all the congregation, those who had returned from captivity' (N viii. 17, cf. E vi. 21), celebrate the feast of Tabernacles. After a solemn confession of sin, the erring 'seed of Israel' separate from the heathen (ix. 1 seq.), and this epoch-making event, which (see E x. 1-12) might be expected after the prayer in E ix. 6 seqq., is followed by a second prayer on behalf of the backsliding people. Finally, there is a covenant (N ix. 38) signed by the congregation and all that separated themselves from the people of the land (x. 28). Whether we follow the tradition or any modern hypothesis, these data are extremely complicated (see Kesters, 67, 96 seqq., *Th. T.*, xxix, 554 seqq.). They point to a close literary connexion in the E-story, which makes it improbable that E vii.-x. should be severed, as in MT, from N viii. seqq. They reveal a serious literary intricacy which must be due to revision and reshaping, and they do not show at all clearly that the 'children of the captivity' who returned (E viii. 35) found a people constituted as E ii. 59-63, vi. 21, would imply. It is possible that the E-story (of independent origin, see *Introd.* p. 9 *d.*) has confused the accounts of the purification of the exiles who returned with E and the separation of the native Judaeans from the heathen, the two events which are kept more distinct in E i.-vi.

The return of Ezra, viii. 1-67 = E vii., viii., cf. Jos. xi. 5 1-2 (who replaces Artaxerxes by Xerxes). In addition to the comm., see Torrey, 196 seqq., 205 seqq., 265 seqq.

2. Azariai and Zechrias (E^a; Ἐζερίων Α., Ἀζαρίων L.) = Seraiah and Azariah. The former was contemporary with the fall of Jerusalem (1 Chron. vi. 14 seq.), but the genealogy would make him identical with the Seraiah in Neh. xi. 11 (|| 1 Chron. ix. 11, Azariah), priest at the renovation of the city.

E^a omits the names Memeroth—Savias (Uzzi).

5. temple-servants, mg. the Nethinim, cf. i. 3, and for the sequence of the classes cf. the arrangement in v. 9 seqq.

6. The date of arrival (E 8) probably coincides with that of Nehemiah (departure in the first month, ii. 1; arrival at the beginning of the fifth, interval of three days, ii. 11; and, after fifty-two days, the completion of the walls on the 25th of the sixth month, vi. 15).

seventh year (E^a 'second', cf. v. 6, vi. 1), the absence of a date in v. 1 is noticeable. On the chronological and other details in the verse see the comm.

for his sake, E^a ἐπὶ αὐτῶν, E^a om., E^b (v. 7) ἐπὶ αὐτῶν γὰρ ὁ Ἐζδρας ἦν, ὅς . . .

7. but taught, so E^a δὲδασαυ. For the variants see Moulton, *ZATW*, xx. 14.

8 Now the commission, which was written from Artaxerxes the king, came to Esdras the priest and reader of the law of the Lord, whereof this that followeth is a copy:

9 King Artaxerxes unto Esdras the priest and reader of the law of the Lord, greeting: Having determined to deal graciously, I have given order, that such of the nation of the Jews, and of the priests and Levites, and of those within our realm, as are willing and desirous, should go with thee unto Jerusalem. As many therefore as have a mind *therunto*, let them depart with thee, as it hath seemed good both to me and my seven friends the counsellors; that they may look unto the affairs of Judaea and Jerusalem, agreeably to that which is in the law of the Lord, and carry the gifts unto the Lord of Israel to Jerusalem, which I and my friends have vowed;

14 and that all the gold and silver that can be found in the country of Babylonia for the Lord in Jerusalem, with that also which is given of the people for the temple of the Lord their God that is at Jerusalem, be collected: even the gold and silver for bullocks, rams, and lambs, and things therunto appertaining; to the end that they may offer sacrifices unto the Lord upon the altar of the Lord their God, which is in Jerusalem.

16 And whatsoever thou and thy brethren are minded to do with gold and silver, that perform, according to the will of thy God. And the holy vessels of the Lord, which are given thee for the use of the temple of thy God, which is in Jerusalem:

18 and whatsoever thing else thou shalt remember for the use of the temple of thy God, thou shalt give it out of the king's treasury. And I king Artaxerxes have also commanded the keepers of the treasures in Syria and Phœnicia, that whatsoever Esdras the priest and reader of the law of the Most High God shall send for, they should give it him with all diligence, to the sum of a hundred talents of silver, likewise also of wheat even to a hundred measures, and a hundred firkins of wine, and salt in abundance.

Now this is the copy of the letter that the king 11 Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the priest, the scribe, even the scribe of the words of the commandments of the Lord, and of his statutes to Israel. Artaxerxes, king of kings, unto Ezra the priest, 12 the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, perfect and so forth. I make a decree, that all they 13 of the people of Israel, and their priests and the Levites, in my realm, which are minded of their own free will to go to Jerusalem, go with thee.

Forasmuch as thou art sent of the king and his 14 seven counsellors, to inquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem, according to the law of thy God which is in thine hand;

and to carry the silver 15 and gold, which the king and his counsellors have freely offered unto the God of Israel, whose habitation is in Jerusalem, and all the silver and 16 gold that thou shalt find in all the province of Babylon, with the freewill offering of the people, and of the priests, offering willingly for the house of their God which is in Jerusalem;

therefore 17 thou shalt with all diligence buy with this money bullocks, rams, lambs, with their meal offerings and their drink offerings, and shalt offer them upon the altar of the house of your God which is in Jerusalem. And whatsoever shall seem 18 good to thee and to thy brethren to do with the rest of the silver and the gold, that do ye after the will of your God. And the vessels that are 19 given thee for the service of the house of thy God, deliver thou before the God of Jerusalem. And whatsoever more shall be needful for the 20 house of thy God, which thou shalt have occasion to bestow, bestow it out of the king's treasure house. And I, even I Artaxerxes the king, do 21 make a decree to all the treasurers which are beyond the river, that whatsoever Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, shall require of you, it be done with all diligence,

unto 22 an hundred talents of silver, and to an hundred measures of wheat, and to an hundred baths of wine, and to an hundred baths of oil, and salt

8-24. Jos. xi. 5 1, §§ 123-30 reproduces this remarkable decree more carefully than he does the rest of the Ezra story. The document, which is in Aramaic, should be compared with the decrees of Cyrus and Darius (see Torrey, 158): its value rests upon the Ezra-story as a whole and is variously estimated (see Bierth., 34 seq., Nikel, 167 seqq.). According to Jewish tradition, of course, the book of Esther, with the story of the favour of Xerxes, would precede the present situation. 7. 8 G has no conclusion and there are signs of unevenness especially in 9 seq. and 22.

9 seq. Read, perhaps E 12 seq., 'perfect peace, and now I make . . .' (cf. E v. 7).

10. Some words are probably missing at the beginning (Lupton).

and of those, mg. being within G^{sa} L S.

17. Jos. preises *ἀνθήματα*, L^a 'pones', cf. MT *deliver* (rather 'hand over wholly'). The MT *God of Jerusalem* (G^{sa} 'before God [G^a 'the God of Israel'] in J.') is very strange.

18. remember (*ἵνα ἢ ἐπιπέσῃ σοι*), rather, 'shall occur to, or befall thee', MT 'thou shalt have to give'.

19. send for (i; *shall require*), a misreading (*שָׁלַח* for *שָׁמַר*; so Ball, Moulton), or merely a paraphrase.

20. salt (L and some MSS. of G), mg. other things (G^a L; B om.); L^a 'salsine mensura et caetera sine men.': G^a S 'and other things according to the law of God' (see v. 21).

21 Let all things be performed after the law of God diligently unto the Most High God, that wrath come not upon the kingdom of the king and his sons.

22 I command you also, that no tax, nor any other imposition, be laid on any of the priests, or Levites, or holy singers, or porters, or temple-servants, or any that have employment in this temple, and that no man have authority to impose anything upon them. And thou, Esdras, according to the wisdom of God ordain judges and justices, that they may judge in all Syria and Phœnicia all those that know the law of thy God; and those that know it not thou shalt teach.

24 And whosoever shall transgress the law of thy God, and of the king, shall be punished diligently, whether it be by death, or other punishment, by penalty of money, or by imprisonment.

25 Then said Esdras the scribe, Blessed be the only Lord, the God of my fathers, who hath put these things into the heart of the king, to glorify his house that is in Jerusalem: and hath honoured me in the sight of the king, and his counsellors, and all his friends and nobles. Therefore was I encouraged by the help of the Lord my God, and gathered together out of Israel men to go up with me.

28 And these are the chief according to their families and the several divisions thereof, that went up with me from Babylon in the reign of king Artaxerxes: of the sons of Phinees, Gerson: of the sons of Ithamar, Gamael: of the sons of David, Attus the son of Sechenias: of the sons of Phoros, Zacharias; and with him were counted a hundred and fifty men: of the sons of Phaath Moab, Eliaonias the son of Zariaas, and with him two hundred men: of the sons of Zathoes, Sechenias the son of Jezelus, and with him three hundred men: of the sons of Adin, Obeth the son of Jonathan, and with him two hundred and fifty men: of the sons of Elam, Jesias son of Gotholias, and with him seventy men:

without prescribing how much. Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be done exactly for the house of the God of heaven; for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons? Also we certify you, that touching any of the priests and Levites, the singers, porters, Nethinim, or servants of this house of God, it shall not be lawful to impose tribute, custom, or toll, upon them.

And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God that is in thine hand, appoint magistrates and judges, which may judge all the people that are beyond the river, all such as know the laws of thy God; and teach ye him that knoweth them not. And whosoever will not do the law of thy God, and the law of the king, let judgement be executed upon him with all diligence, whether it be unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment.

Blessed be the Lord, the God of our fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the king's heart, to beautify the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem; and hath extended mercy unto me before the king, and his counsellors, and before all the king's mighty princes. And I was strengthened according to the hand of the Lord my God upon me, and I gathered together out of Israel chief men to go up with me.

Now these are the heads of their fathers' houses, and this is the genealogy of them that went up with me from Babylon, in the reign of Artaxerxes the king. Of the sons of Phinehas, Gershom: of the sons of Ithamar, Daniel: of the sons of David, Hattush. Of the sons of Shecaniah; of the sons of Parosh, Zechariah; and with him were reckoned by genealogy of the males an hundred and fifty. Of the sons of Pahath-moab, Eliehoenai the son of Zerariah; and with him two hundred males. Of the sons of Shecaniah, the son of Jahaziel; and with him three hundred males. And of the sons of Adin, Ebed the son of Jonathan; and with him fifty males. And of the sons of Elam, Jeshaiah the son of Athaliah; and with him seventy males.

22. The decree is now addressed to the Persian officials in Palestine, cf. the direct address E vi. 6 seq., and the abstract in E iv. 49 seqq.

that have employment, *πρωτοδικαίους τοῦ ἱεροῦ*; *ἱ. S.* 'scribes of the temple' (as though *πρωτοδικαίους*).

24. punishment, *ἔσθλα τιμωρία*, *l. ἀτιμία*, *ἱ. cruciatus*, *ἱ. tormentis*, *E. banishment*, prop. 'uprooting', *ἔσθλα ἰσχυρία*.

imprisonment, *ing. captivitas*, *ἔσθλα ἀναγωγή*, *l. δεσμεύσασα*, *ἱ. abductione*, *ἱ. exilio*. *Jos. + ἵππουρο*, cf. *E. Lag. bene valeas*.

25. Then . . . scribe, *ἔσθλα om.*, *ἱ. om. the scribe*.

Blessed . . . , or 'blessed alone be the Lord' (Ball).

28-40. Ezra's band. With the priestly families (v. 29), cf. Eleazar and Ithamar, 1 Chron. xxiv. 2 seqq., where the priesthood is not restricted to the Zadokites but as a compromise a share is given to the subordinate family of Ithamar. For the priestly and Davidic families, cf. E v. 5. With the preferable reading: Hattush of the sons of Shecaniah (v. 29), cf. 1 Chron. iii. 22. The names of the twelve (see v. 4) lay families recur in the great register E v.; Pahath-moab and Joab (vv. 31, 35) are, however, severed (contrast v. 11). The sons of Zattu (v. 32) are wrongly omitted in E (but see *ἔσθλα* ib.). Zariaas represents Zerariah in v. 31, but Zebadiah in v. 34; Jezelus (v. 35) = Jehiel, cf. on i. 8. The family of Bani (v. 36) is wanting in E (but see *ἔσθλα* ib.). *Italvarus* (v. 40) = Zabbud or Zaccur; see *E. Di.*, art. Zabud (2); Bayer 56 would restore עזרי בן יכור. For other details see the comm.

34 of the
 35 sons of Saphatias, Zaratias son of Michael, and
 36 with him threescore and ten men: of the sons
 37 of Joab, Abadias son of Jezelus, and with him
 38 two hundred and twelve men: of the sons of
 39 Banias, Salimoth son of Josaphias, and with him
 40 a hundred and threescore men: of the sons of
 41 Babi, Zacharias son of Bebai, and with him
 42 twenty and eight men: of the sons of Astath,
 43 Joannes son of Akatan, and with him a hun-
 44 dred and ten men: of the sons of Adonikam,
 45 the last, and these are the names of them, Eli-
 46 phalat, Jeuel, and Samaïas, and with them
 47 seventy men: of the sons of Bago, Uthi the son
 48 of Istaleurus, and with him seventy men.
 49 And I gathered them together to the river
 50 called Theras; and there we pitched our tents
 51 three days, and I surveyed them. But when
 52 I had found there none of the priests and
 53 Levites, then sent I unto Eleazar, and Iduef,
 54 and Maasmas, and Elnathan, and Samaïas, and
 55 Joribus, Nathan, Ennatan, Zacharias, and Mo-
 56 sollamus, principal men and men of understand-
 57 ing. And I bade them that they should go unto
 58 Loddeus the captain, who was in the place of
 59 the treasury: and commanded them that they
 60 should speak unto Loddeus, and to his brethren,
 61 and to the treasurers in that place, to send us
 62 such men as might execute the priests' office in
 63 the house of our Lord. And by the mighty
 64 hand of our Lord they brought unto us men of
 65 understanding of the sons of Mooli the son of
 66 Levi, the son of Israel, Asebebias, and his sons,
 67 and his brethren, who were eighteen,
 68 and
 69 Asebias, and Annuus, and Osaias his brother, of
 70 the sons of Chanuneus, and their sons were
 71 twenty men; and of the temple-servants whom
 72 David and the principal men had appointed for
 73 the service of the Levites, two hundred and
 74 twenty temple-servants, the catalogue of all their
 75 names was shewed. And there I vowed a fast
 76 for the young men before our Lord, to desire of
 77 him a prosperous journey both for us and for
 78 our children and cattle that were with us:
 79 for
 80 I was ashamed to ask of the king footmen, and
 81 horsemen, and conduct for safeguard against
 82 our adversaries. For we had said unto the
 83 king, that the power of our Lord would be with

And of the sons of Shephatiah, Zebadiah the 8
 son of Michael; and with him fourscore males.
 Of the sons of Joab, Obadiah the son of Jehiel; 9
 and with him two hundred and eighteen males.
 And of the sons of Shelomith, the son of Josi- 10
 phiah; and with him an hundred and threescore
 males. And of the sons of Bebai, Zechariah the 11
 son of Bebai; and with him twenty and eight
 males. And of the sons of Azgad, Johanan the 12
 son of Hakkatan; and with him an hundred and
 ten males. And of the sons of Adonikam, that 13
 were the last; and these are their names, Eliphe-
 let, Jeuel, and Shemaiah, and with them three-
 score males. And of the sons of Bigvai, Uthai 14
 and Zabbud; and with them seventy males.

And I gathered them together to the river 15
 that runneth to Ahava; and there we encamped
 three days; and I viewed the people, and the
 priests, and found there none of the sons of Levi.
 Then sent I for Eliezer, for Ariel, for Shemaiah, 16
 and for Elnathan, and for Jarib, and for Elnathan,
 and for Nathan, and for Zechariah, and for Me-
 shallam, chief men; also for Joiarib, and for El-
 nathan, which were teachers. And I sent them 17
 forth unto Iddo the chief at the place Casiphia;
 and I told them what they should say unto Iddo,
 and his brethren the Nethinim, at the place
 Casiphia, that they should bring unto us minis-
 ters for the house of our God.

And according 18
 to the good hand of our God upon us they
 brought us a man of discretion, of the sons of
 Mahli, the son of Levi, the son of Israel; and
 Sherebiah, with his sons and his brethren, eight-
 teen; and Hashabiah, and with him Jeshaiah of 19
 the sons of Merari, his brethren and their sons,
 twenty;

and of the Nethinim; whom David and 20
 the princes had given for the service of the
 Levites, two hundred and twenty Nethinim: all
 of them were expressed by name.

Then I pro- 21
 claimed a fast there, at the river Ahava, that we
 might humble ourselves before our God, to seek
 of him a straight way, for us, and for our little
 ones, and for all our substance. For I was 22
 ashamed to ask of the king a band of soldiers
 and horsemen to help us against the enemy in
 the way: because we had spoken unto the king,
 saying, The hand of our God is upon all them

41. called, perhaps a better reading (Ew. 137 n. 4).

Theras (E^o om.), see v. 50, 61. Jos. § 134 'beyond (? πέραν for Θέραι, Lupton) the Euphrates'.

42. In E only the Levites are absent, see v. 29 and note the textual difficulties in 42 seqq. (see Berth.), and elsewhere where the priests and Levites are concerned.

43 seq. sent I unto. Omit unto; the accusative ἵ (see esp. 2 Chron. xvii. 7) was misunderstood.

45. place of the treasury, E. Casiphia, but cf. E^o ib. Cf. also v. 46, where, too, the Nethinim are ignored.

47. men, mg. a man (E^o).

48. Annuus = MT ἄνω with him' (to be read eth, a mark of the accusative).

Chanuneus (E Merari) might suggest Chenani(ah), Neh. ix. 4, 1 Chron. xv. 22, &c.

50. for the young men, an obscure statement, perhaps a misreading of E's river (נָהָר for נָהָר), Ahava being omitted (Ball).

them that seek him, to support them in all ways.
 53 And again we besought our Lord as touching these things, and found him favourable *unto us*.
 54 Then I separated twelve men of the chiefs of the priests, Eserebias, and Assamias, and ten men of their brethren with them :
 55 and I weighed them the silver, and the gold, and the holy vessels of the house of our Lord, which the king, and his counsellors, and the nobles, and all Israel, had given. And when I had weighed it, I delivered
 56 unto them six hundred and fifty talents of silver, and silver vessels of a hundred talents, and a hundred talents of gold, and twenty golden vessels,
 57 and twelve vessels of brass, even of fine brass, glittering like gold. And I said unto them, Both ye are holy unto the Lord, and the vessels are holy, and the gold and the silver are a vow unto
 58 the Lord, the Lord of our fathers. Watch ye, and keep them till ye deliver them to the chiefs of the priests and Levites, and to the principal men of the families of Israel, in Jerusalem, in the chambers of the house of our Lord.
 60 So the priests and the Levites, who received the silver and the gold and the vessels which were in Jerusalem, brought them into the temple of the Lord.
 61 And from the river Theras we departed the twelfth day of the first month, until we came to Jerusalem, by the mighty hand of our Lord which was upon us: and the Lord delivered us from *assault by the way*, from every enemy, and
 62 so we came to Jerusalem. And when we had been there three days, the silver and gold was weighed and delivered in the house of our Lord on the fourth day unto Marmoth the priest
 63 the son of Urias. And with him was Eleazar the son of Phineas, and with them were Josabds the son of Jesus and Moeth the son of Sabannus, the Levites: all *was delivered them* by number and weight.
 64 And all the weight of them was written up the same hour.
 65 Moreover they that were come out of the captivity offered sacrifices unto the Lord, the God of Israel, even twelve bullocks for all Israel, fourscore and sixteen rams,
 66 threescore and twelve lambs, goats for a peace offering, twelve; all of them a sacrifice to the

that seek him, for good; but his power and his wrath is against all them that forsake him. So
 23 we fasted and besought our God for this: and he was intreated of us. Then I separated twelve
 24 of the chiefs of the priests, even Sherebiah, Hashabiah, and ten of their brethren with them, and weighed unto them the silver, and the gold,
 25 and the vessels, even the offering for the house of our God, which the king, and his counsellors, and his princes, and all Israel there present, had offered: I even weighed into their hand
 26 hundred and fifty talents of silver, and silver vessels an hundred talents; of gold an hundred talents; and twenty bowls of gold, of a thousand
 27 darics; and two vessels of fine bright brass, precious as gold. And I said unto them, Ye are
 28 holy unto the Lord, and the vessels are holy; and the silver and the gold are a freewill offering unto the Lord, the God of your fathers. Watch
 29 ye, and keep them, until ye weigh them before the chiefs of the priests and the Levites, and the princes of the fathers' *houses* of Israel, at Jerusalem, in the chambers of the house of the Lord. So the priests and the Levites received
 30 the weight of the silver and the gold, and the vessels, to bring them to Jerusalem unto the house of our God.

Then we departed from the river of Ahava on
 31 the twelfth *day* of the first month, to go unto Jerusalem: and the hand of our God was upon us, and he delivered us from the hand of the enemy and the lie in wait by the way. And
 32 we came to Jerusalem, and abode there three days.

And on the fourth day was the silver and
 33 the gold and the vessels weighed in the house of our God into the hand of Meremoth the son of Uriah the priest; and with him was Eleazar the son of Phinehas; and with them was Jozabad the son of Jeshua, and Noadiah the son of Bin-nui, the Levites; the whole by number and by
 34 weight: and all the weight was written at that time. The children of the captivity, which were
 35 come out of exile, offered burnt offerings unto the God of Israel, twelve bullocks for all Israel, ninety and six rams, seventy and seven lambs, twelve he-goats for a sin offering: all this was a burnt offering unto the Lord.

54. Eserebias (= Sherebiah), \mathfrak{S}^{a} prefix 'and'; there are thus twelve Levites (cf. v. 47 seq., N xii. 24) and twelve priests (cf. v. 60). E includes the two men and their brethren among the twelve priests.

55. all Israel, Jos. 'who remained at Babylon' (cf. v. 13 seq.), some qualification is necessary.

57. twelve, \mathfrak{S}^{a} 'ten'.

58. holy, cf. Is. lii. 11.

and the vessels . . . , mg. and the vessels and the silver and the gold, *S^c*, (\mathfrak{S}^{a}).

60. which [were] in Jerusalem, the words belong to the end of the verse.

61. every enemy, reading \mathfrak{S}^{a} for \mathfrak{S}^{b} . \mathfrak{S}^{b} confuses the first and the third person (for the latter see 65-7) and omits 'our' in v. 62. See on v. 68 seqq.

66. peace offering, or thank-offering, cf. the Geneva Bible 'for salvation'. For E cf. vii. 7 seq. (E vi. 17).

67 Lord. And they delivered the king's commandments unto the king's stewards, and to the governors of Coelestria and Phoenicia; and they honoured the people and the temple of the Lord.

68 Now when these things were done, the principal men came unto me, and said, The nation of Israel, and the princes, and the priests and the Levites, have not put away *from them* the strange people of the land, nor the uncleannesses of the Gentiles, *to wit*, of the Canaanites, Hittites, Pherezites, Jebusites, and the Moabites, Egyptians, and Edomites. For both they and their sons have married with their daughters, and the holy seed is mixed with the strange people of the land; and from the beginning of this matter the rulers and the nobles have been partakers of this iniquity. And as soon as I had heard these things, I rent my clothes, and my holy garment, and plucked the hair from off my head and beard, and sat me down sad and full of heaviness. So all they that were moved at the word of the Lord, the God of Israel, assembled unto me, whilst I mourned for the iniquity: but I sat still full of heaviness until the evening sacrifice. Then rising up from the fast with my clothes and my holy garment rent, and bowing my knees, and stretching forth my hands unto the Lord,

74 I said, O Lord, I am ashamed and confounded before thy face: for our sins are multiplied above our heads, and our errors have reached up unto heaven,

76 ever since the time of our fathers; and we are in great sin, even unto this day. And for our sins and our fathers' we with our brethren and our kings and our priests were given up unto the kings of the earth, to the sword, and to captivity, and for a prey with shame, unto this day.

78 And now in some measure hath mercy been shewed unto us from thee, O Lord, that there should be left us a root and a name in the place of thy sanctuary; and to discover unto us a light in the house of the Lord our God, *and* to give us food in the time of our servitude. Yea, when we were in bondage, we were not forsaken of our Lord; but he made us gracious before the kings of Persia, so that they gave us food, and glorified the temple

And they delivered the king's commissions unto the king's satraps, and to the governors beyond the river: and they furthered the people and the house of God.

Now when these things were done, the princes drew near unto me, saying, The people of Israel, and the priests and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands, *doing* according to their abominations, even of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. For they have taken of their daughters for themselves and for their sons; so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the peoples of the lands: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass. And when I heard this thing, I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair of my head and of my beard, and sat down astonished.

Then were assembled unto me every one that trembled at the words of the God of Israel, because of the trespass of them of the captivity; and I sat astonished until the evening oblation. And at the evening oblation I arose up from my humiliation, even with my garment and my mantle rent; and I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands unto the Lord my God; and I said, O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God: for our iniquities are increased over our head, and our guiltiness is grown up unto the heavens. Since the days of our fathers we have been exceeding guilty unto this day; and for our iniquities have we, our kings, and our priests, been delivered into the hand of the kings of the lands, to the sword, to captivity, and to spoiling, and to confusion of face, as it is this day. And now for a little moment grace hath been shewed from the Lord our God, to leave us a remnant to escape, and to give us a nail in his holy place, that our God may lighten our eyes, and give us a little reviving in our bondage.

For we are bondmen; yet our God hath not forsaken us in our bondage, but hath extended mercy unto us in the sight of the kings of Persia, to give us a reviving, to set up

67. honoured, *hōdōsan* (so E^g), cf. viii. 25, 31, and Is. lx. 13; a weak and inappropriate rendering (Ew. 138 n. 6).

The mixed marriages, *viv.* 68-90 = E lx., cf. Jos. xi. 5 3. See below on ix. 37 seqq. E^g gives the narrative in the third person.

69. the uncleannesses . . . , mg. *nor their uncleannesses* (to wit) of the Gentiles, *etc.* (E^g).

Edomites, see iv. 45, 50.

72. So all they, E^g + 'that were zealous and all they'.

73. fast, cf. E R.V. mg. *fasting*.

75. multiplied above . . . , E^g L S 'multiplied more than the hairs of our head', cf. Ps. xl. 12.

77. we with our brethren (וְעִמָּנוּ 'we' read as וְעִמָּנוּ).

78. root (cf. v. 88), perhaps influenced by 2 Kings xix. 30 seqq. (Bayer, 15).

79. food, E *reviving* (מִיָּדָה, cf. Judg. vi. 4).

of our Lord, and raised up the desolate Zion, to give us a sure abiding in Jewry and Jerusalem.
 82 And now, O Lord, what shall we say, having these things? for we have transgressed thy commandments, which thou gavest by the hand of thy
 83 servants the prophets, saying, That the land, which ye enter into to possess as an heritage, is a land polluted with the pollutions of the strangers of the land, and they have filled it with their uncleanness.

84 Therefore now shall ye not join your daughters unto their sons, neither shall ye take
 85 their daughters unto your sons. Neither shall ye seek to have peace with them for ever, that ye may be strong, and eat the good things of the land, and that ye may leave it for an inheritance unto your children for evermore. And all that is befallen is done unto us for our wicked works and great sins: for thou, O Lord, didst
 87 make our sins light, and didst give unto us such a root: but we have turned back again to transgress thy law, in mingling ourselves with the
 88 uncleanness of the heathen of the land. Thou wast not angry with us to destroy us, till thou hadst left us neither root, seed, nor name.

89 O Lord of Israel, thou art true: for we are left a
 90 root this day. Behold, now are we before thee in our iniquities, for we cannot stand any longer before thee by reason of these things.

91 And as Esdras in his prayer made his confession, weeping, and lying flat upon the ground before the temple, there gathered unto him from Jerusalem a very great throng of men and women and children: for there was great weeping among the multitude. Then Jechonias the son of Jeelus, one of the sons of Israel, called out, and said, O Esdras, we have sinned against the Lord God, we have married strange women of the heathen of the land, and now is all Israel aloft.
 93 Let us make an oath unto the Lord herein, that we will put away all our wives, which we have
 94 taken of the strangers, with their children, like as seemeth good unto thee, and to as many as do obey the law of the Lord.

95 Arise, and put in execution: for to thee doth this matter appertain, and we

the house of our God, and to repair the ruins thereof, and to give us a wall in Judah and in Jerusalem. And now, O our God, what shall
 10 we say after this? for we have forsaken thy commandments, which thou hast commanded by
 11 thy servants the prophets, saying, The land, unto which ye go to possess it, is an unclean land through the uncleanness of the peoples of the lands, through their abominations, which have filled it from one end to another with their filthiness. Now therefore give not your daughters
 12 unto their sons, neither take their daughters unto your sons, nor seek their peace or their prosperity for ever: that ye may be strong, and eat the good of the land, and leave it for an inheritance to your children for ever.

And after
 13 all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great guilt, seeing that thou our God hast punished us less than our iniquities deserve, and hast given us such a remnant, shall we again
 14 break thy commandments, and join in affinity with the peoples that do these abominations? wouldest not thou be angry with us till thou hadst consumed us, so that there should be no remnant, nor any to escape? O Lord, the God
 15 of Israel, thou art righteous; for we are left a remnant that is escaped, as it is this day: behold, we are before thee in our guiltiness; for none can stand before thee because of this.

Now while Ezra prayed, and made confession,
 10 1 weeping and casting himself down before the house of God, there was gathered together unto him out of Israel a very great congregation of men and women and children: for the people wept very sore. And Shecaniah the son of
 2 Jehiel, one of the sons of Elam, answered and said unto Ezra, We have trespassed against our God, and have married strange women of the peoples of the land: yet now there is hope for Israel concerning this thing. Now therefore let
 3 us make a covenant with our God to put away all the wives, and such as are born of them, according to the counsel of my lord, and of those that tremble at the commandment of our God; and let it be done according to the law. Arise: 4
 for the matter belongeth unto thee, and we are

81. **Sion.** G. A. Smith (*Jerusalem*, i, 150 seq.) observes that the term is not found in Ezek., Chron. (except the quotations 1 Chron. xi. 5, 2 Chron. v. 2), E and N.

82. **having . . . transgressed,** presumably based upon misreadings אָחַז for 'אָחַר, עֲבַרְנוּ for 'עָבַרְנוּ (see Ball).

86. **make . . . light,** cf. E 85.

88. **Thou wast not,** mg. *wast thou not*, &c., see E.

The marriage-reforms, viii. 91-ix. 36 = E, x., cf. Jos. xi. 5 4.

92. **Israel** (Jos. 'Jerusalem'), E *Elam*, cf. E x. 26.

aloft, mg. *exalted* (with a reference to Deut. xxxviii. 13, לָמַעַל). This points to the reading סָעַל 'trespass' (E ix. 2, 4, x. 6) for סָעַל 'hope' (E^s S here) and is preferred by Jahn. ל et nunc es super omnem Israel (L^e et nunc de populo I). Bayer (16) conj. ἐνάω corruption of ἐνομαί (E 85).

'Concerning this thing' in E is read by E^s L at the beginning of E 93.

94. E^s S 'and as many as obeyed . . . having arisen, said unto Ezra, Arise . . .' (reading: וְכָמוֹתָם וְעָמְדוּ לְעִזְרָא אֲרִיזוּ . . .).

95. **put into execution,** לָקַח has probably dropped out from the MT (Guthe, *SBOT*).

96 will be with thee to do valiantly. So Esdras arose, and took an oath of the chief of the priests and Levites of all Israel to do after these things; and so they sware.

9 Then Esdras rising from the court of the temple went to the chamber of Jonas the son of Eliasib, and lodged there, and did eat no bread nor drink water, mourning for the great iniquities of the multitude.

3 And there was made proclamation in all Jewry and Jerusalem to all them that were of the captivity, that they should be gathered together at Jerusalem: and that whosoever met not there within two or three days, according as the elders that bare rule appointed, their cattle should be seized to the use of the temple, and himself cast out from the multitude of them that were of the captivity.

5 And in three days were all they of the tribe of Judah and Benjamin gathered together at Jerusalem: this was the ninth month, on the twentieth day of the month. And all the multitude sat together trembling in the broad place before the temple because of the present foul weather. So Esdras arose up, and said unto them, Ye have transgressed the law and married strange wives, thereby to increase the sins of Israel. And now make confession and give glory unto the Lord, the God of our fathers, and do his will, and separate yourselves from the heathen of the land, and from the strange women. Then cried the whole multitude, and said with a loud voice, Like as thou hast spoken, so will we do. But forasmuch as the multitude is great, and it is foul weather, so that we cannot stand without, and this is not a work of one day or two, seeing our sin in these things is spread far: therefore let the rulers of the multitude stay, and let all them of our habitations that have strange wives come at the time appointed, and with them the rulers and judges of every place, till we turn away the wrath of the Lord from us for this matter.

14 Then Jonathan the son of Azael and Ezekias the son of Thocanus accordingly took the matter upon them: and Mosollamus and Levis and Sabbateus were assessors

with thee: be of good courage, and do it. Then 5 arose Ezra, and made the chiefs of the priests, the Levites, and all Israel, to swear that they would do according to this word. So they sware. Then Ezra rose up from before the 6 house of God, and went into the chamber of Jehohanan the son of Eliashib: and when he came thither, he did eat no bread, nor drink water: for he mourned because of the trespass of them of the captivity. And they made pro- 7 clamation throughout Judah and Jerusalem unto all the children of the captivity, that they should gather themselves together unto Jerusalem; and 8 that whosoever came not within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and the elders, all his substance should be forfeited, and himself separated from the congregation of the captivity.

Then all the men of Judah and Ben- 9 jamin gathered themselves together unto Jerusalem within the three days; it was the ninth month, on the twentieth day of the month: and all the people sat in the broad place before the house of God, trembling because of this matter, and for the great rain. And Ezra the priest 10 stood up, and said unto them, Ye have transgressed, and have married strange women, to increase the guilt of Israel. Now therefore make 11 confession unto the Lord, the God of your fathers, and do his pleasure: and separate yourselves from the peoples of the land, and from the strange women. Then all the congregation 12 answered and said with a loud voice, As thou hast said concerning us, so must we do. But the 13 people are many, and it is a time of much rain, and we are not able to stand without, neither is this a work of one day or two: for we have greatly transgressed in this matter. Let now 14 our princes be appointed for all the congregation, and let all them that are in our cities which have married strange women come at appointed times, and with them the elders of every city, and the judges thereof, until the fierce wrath of our God be turned from us, until this matter be despatched. Only Jonathan the son of Asahel and 15 Jahzeiah the son of Tikvah stood up against this matter: and Meshullam and Shabbethai the Levite helped them.

96. the chief (rather chiefs, as in viii. 49) . . . and Levites, for and see Guthe, SBOT.

IX. 2. lodged there, rightly reading לְיָדָיו for לְיָדָיו.

6. in the broad place. According to Jos. § 149 there was a meeting of the elders in the upper room (but Niese *ἐπιθυμῶν*) of the temple.

8. \mathfrak{E}^{24} Give confession (\mathfrak{E}^1 + and) glory; a doublet of תְּהַלֵּל (Fr., &c.).

11. forasmuch as, wanting in \mathfrak{E} .

13. for this matter, cf. E. R.V. mg. as touching this matter.

14. took the matter (*ἐπέβησαν*, cf. with Fr. 1 Macc. i. 42); cf. E. R.V. mg. were appointed over this (matter). On the conflicting interpretations of this passage see the comm.

Ezekias, mg. *Ezias* (\mathfrak{E}^{24} S).

Levis . . . ; E \mathfrak{E}^1 'the Levites'.

assessors, \mathfrak{E} *συνεπιθεσαν*, \mathfrak{L} cooperati (\mathfrak{L}^c consenserunt).

15 to them. And they that were of the captivity did according to all these things.

16 And Esdras the priest chose unto him principal men of their families, all by name: and on the new moon of the tenth month they were shut in together to examine the matter. So their cause that held strange wives was brought to an end by the new moon of the first month.

18 And of the priests that were come together, and had strange wives, there were found; of the sons of Jesus the son of Josedek, and his brethren; Mathelas, and Eleazar, and Joribus, and Joadanus. And they gave their hands to put away their wives, and to offer rams to make reconciliation for their error. And of the sons of Emmer; Ananias, and Zabdeus, and Manes, and Sameus, and Hiereel, and Azarias.

22 And of the sons of Phaisur; Elionas, Massias, Ismael, and Nathanael, and Ocidelus, and Saloas. And of the Levites; Jozabdu, and Semeis, and Colius, who was called Calitas, and Patheus, and Judas, and Jonas.

24 Of the holy singers; Eliasibus, Bacchurus. Of the

26 porters; Sallumus, and Tolbanes. Of Israel, of the sons of Phoros; Hiermas, and Ieddias, and Melchias, and Maelus, and Eleazar, and Asibias,

27 and Banneas. Of the sons of Ela; Matthanias, Zacharias, and Jezrielus, and Oabdius, and Hieremoth, and Aedias. And of the sons of Zamoth; Eliadas, Eliasimus, Othonias, Jarimoth, and Sabathus, and Zardeus. Of the sons of Bebai;

29 Joannes, and Ananias, and Jozabdu, and Ematheis. Of the sons of Mani; Olamus, Mamuchus, Jedeus, Jasubus, and Jasaclus, and Hieremoth.

31 And of the sons of Addi; Naathus, and Moossias, Laccunus, and Naidus, and Matthanias, and Sesthel, Balnuus, and Manasseas. And of the sons

33 of Annas; Elionas, and Aseas, and Melchias, and Sabbeus, and Simon Chosameus. And of the sons of Asom; Maltanneus, and Mattathias, and Sabanneus, Eliphalat, and Manasses, and Semei.

34 And of the sons of Baani; Jeremias, Momdis, Ismaerus, Juel, Mamdai, and Pedias, and Anos, Carabasion, and Enasibus, and Mamnitaneus, Eliasius, Bannus, Eliali, Someis, Selemias, Nathanas; and of the sons of Ezora; Sesis, Ezril,

35 Azaelus, Samatus, Zambri, Josephus. And of the sons of Nooma; Mazitias, Zabadeas, Edos, Juel, Banaias.

And the children of the captivity did so. And Ezra the priest, with certain heads of fathers' houses, after their fathers' houses, and all of them by their names, were separated; and they sat down in the first day of the tenth month to examine the matter. And they made an end with all the men that had married strange women by the first day of the first month. And among the sons of the priests there were found that had married strange women: *namely*, of the sons of Jeshua, the son of Jozadak, and his brethren, Maaseiah, and Eliezer, and Jarib, and Gedaliah. And they gave their hand that they would put away their wives; and being guilty, they offered a ram of the flock for their guilt. And of the sons of Immer; Hanani and Zebadiah. And of the sons of Harim; Maaseiah, and Elijah, and Shemaiah, and Jehiel, and Uzziyah. And of the sons of Pashhur; Elioenai, Maaseiah, Ishmael, Nathanel, Jozabad, and Elasa. And of the Levites; Jozabad, and Shimei, and Kelaiah (the same is Kelita), Pethahiah, Judah, and Eliezer. And of the singers; Eliashib; and of the porters; Shallum, and Telem, and Uri.

And of Israel; of the sons of Parosh; Ramiah, and Izziah, and Malchijah, and Mijamin, and Eleazar, and Malchijah, and Benaiah. And of the sons of Elam; Mattaniah, Zechariah, and Jehiel, and Abdi, and Jeremoth, and Elijah. And of the sons of Zattu; Elioenai, Eliashib, Mattaniah, and Jeremoth, and Zabad, and Aziza. And of the sons of Bebai; Jehohanan, Hananiah, Zabbai, Athlai. And of the sons of Bani; Meshullam, Malluch, and Adaiah, Jashub, and Sheal, Jeremoth.

And of the sons of Pahath-moab; Adna, and Chelal,

Benaiah, Maaseiah, Mattaniah, Bezalel, and Binnui, and Manasseh. And of the sons of Harim; Eliezer, Isshijah, Malchijah, Shemaiah, Shimeon;

Benjamin, Malluch, Shemariah. Of the sons of Hashum; Mattenai, Mattattah, Zabad, Eliphelet,

Jeremai, Manasseh, Shimci. Of the sons of Bani; Maadai, Amram, and Uel; Benaiah,

Bedeiah, Cheluhi; Vaniah, Meremoth, Eliashib; Mattaniah, Mattenai, and Jaasu; and Bani, and Binnui, Shimei; and Shelemiah, and Nathan, and

Adaiah; Machnadebai, Shashai, Sharai; Azarel, and Shelemiah, Shemariah; Shallum, Amariah, Joseph. Of the sons of Nebo; Jeiel, Mattithiah,

16. chose; read accordingly in E 'separated for himself' (Eichhorn, Hayer, &c.), or better (Torrey) 'they separated'.

to examine . . . , MT לָרְדוֹתָם; the singular Heb. word has a no less singular resemblance to 'Darius' (דָּרְיוֹשׁ).

20. Read in E 19 'and for their guilt offering . . . ' (וְעֹשֵׂתָם לְעֹשֵׂתָם) for וְעֹשֵׂתָם 'and being guilty'.

21-36. In view of the tenour of the whole narrative viii. 68-ix. 20 this list of 113 (E. 111 G) offenders is an anticlimax. On the one hand, the separation of the people of Israel generally, though anticipated at this juncture (see viii. 91-ix. 17), is not recorded until N ix. 2, after the reading of the law. On the other hand, the list cannot refer only to 'the congregation that had come out of captivity' with E (N viii. 17, combined with the purified Israel in x. 28), since the families of Harim, Hashum and Nebo did not return with E, but many years earlier under Zerubbabel.

On the variants see the comm. and E B. There are omissions in vv. 21, 25, much confusion in vv. 31 seqq., and Zaccur should be added after Eliashib in E 24 (cf. G¹).

36 All these had taken strange wives, and they put them away with their children.

37 And the priests and Levites, and they that were of Israel, dwelt in Jerusalem, and in the country, on the new moon of the seventh month, and the children of Israel in their habitations.

38 And the whole multitude were gathered together with one accord into the broad place before the porch of the temple toward the east: and they said unto Esdras the priest and reader, Bring the law of Moses, that was given of the Lord, the God of Israel. So Esdras the chief priest brought the law unto the whole multitude both of men and women, and to all the priests, to hear the law on the new moon of the seventh month. 41 And he read in the broad place before the porch of the temple from morning unto midday, before both men and women; and all the multitude gave heed unto the law.

42 And Esdras the priest and reader of the law stood up upon the pulpit of wood, which was made for that purpose. And there stood up by him Mattathias, Sannus, Ananias, Azarias, Urias, Ezekias, Baalsamus, upon the right hand: and upon his left hand, Phaldeus, Misael, Melchias, Lothasubus, Nabarias, Zacha-

Zabad, Zebina, Iddo, and Joel, Benaiah. All 44 these had taken strange wives: and some of them had wives by whom they had children.

So the priests, and the Levites, and the NEH. 7 porters, and the singers, and some of the people, 73 and the Nethinim, and all Israel, dwelt in their cities. And when the seventh month was come, the children of Israel were in their cities.

And all the people gathered themselves together NEH. 8 1 as one man into the broad place that was before the water gate; and they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel.

And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation, 2 both men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month. And he read therein before the 3 broad place that was before the water gate from early morning until midday, in the presence of the men and the women, and of those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law. And Ezra 4 the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose; and beside him stood Mattithiah, and Shema, and Anaiah, and Uriah, and Hilkiah, and Maaseiah, on his right hand; and on his left hand, Pedaiah, and Mis- hael, and Malchijah, and Hashum, and Hash-

36. The MT cannot be translated (R.V. mg. has 'some of the wives had borne children') and E's reading is eminently more intelligible.

The division between the books E and N which occurs at this point is a relatively late feature in the MT. The scribes counted them as one book. This is important in considering questions of the transposition and rearrangement of the contents.

The Reading of the Law, ix. 37-55 = Neh. vii. 73-viii. 13 *cf.* Jos. xi. 5 5. The view is strongly urged (Hoonacker, Ryle, Meyer, Bertholet, Nikel, Jampel, Driver, &c.) that E iv. 7 seqq. (E ii. 16 seqq.), which cannot refer to the return of Ezra, fills partially at least the gap between the books E and N. This would imply a new catastrophe, a new and important return, and a somewhat extensive work of rebuilding in the time of Artaxerxes, after E x. and before N i. On the other hand, the formal proceedings of the adversaries in E iv. 7 seqq. and the words of the king do not suggest that the opponents would be likely to exceed instructions which, in themselves, are not necessarily sufficient to explain the ruined Jerusalem which so deeply moved Nehemiah. Further, it cannot be assumed that the disgrace of 113 offenders in the matter of the mixed marriages aroused the hostility that is represented in N i.-vi. The people themselves had recognized their sin (E viii. 68 seqq.), they feel themselves to be the 'holy seed', and the proposed covenant and the willingness of the people to act 'according to the law' (v. 94, E x. 3), would make the entire tenor of the narrative unintelligible unless the writer was describing the successful issue (despite the obscure opposition in E x. 15) of steps initiated, not by Ezra, but by the community (Meyer, 228, 240, 241 n. 2, Torrey, 278). Moreover, the close literary connexion between E ix. seqq. and N viii. seqq. forbids the severance of these portions (see above, p. 47 c). The sequence of events in E ix. is adopted by many (Michaelis, Fr., Berth., &c.), but can hardly be original, since there is still a lacuna between the reforms and the Reading of the Law, and ix. 37, though the natural introduction to the latter, is not in place after v. 46, where v. 47 seqq. describe another religious event, also dated in the seventh month. Finally, it is a very natural supposition that the law brought by Ezra was being made known during the four months' interval between viii. 67 and 68 (E viii. and ix.); see A. P. Stanley, *Jew. Church*, iii. 118; Lupton, 60. Hence it is highly probable, following Torrey (*Comp.* 29 seqq., *Essays*, 253 seqq., 260 seq.), H. P. Smith (*Hist.* 393), and Kent (*ii.* 369 seqq.), that the introduction of the law to the notice of the people came at the beginning of Ezra's work (after E viii.), and thus explains the people's recognition of their sins. Such an arrangement is found in the Greek summaries of Esdras Book I (= E) and Esdras Book II (= N) in Lag. *Sept. Stud.*, ii, 84 (see below, p. 58).

38. For the *involuntarily* of v. 47, ix. 6. Perhaps the compiler who placed this narrative before N i.-viii. believed that the water-gate was in ruins (see N iii. 26); *cf.* the adjustment in E iii. 1.

39. עזרא 'the chief priest', v. 40, 49 (contrast N).

40. the priests: a misreading of כֹּהֲנָיִם for לְכֹהֲנָיִם (see E viii. 16, 1 Chron. xxv. 8), or merely a paraphrase; in any case in an unsuitable position.

41. all the multitude . . . mg. they gave all heed (עָשׂוּ).

43 seqq. E adds Azariah after Ananiah, reads Hzeekiah for Hilkiah, and perhaps rightly omits Meshullam. For other variants see E B1, and comm.

45 rias. Then took Esdras the book of the law before the multitude, and sat honourably in the first place before all.

46 And when he opened the law, they stood all straight up. So Esdras blessed the Lord God Most High, the God of hosts, Almighty. And all the people answered, Amen; and lifting up their hands they fell to the ground, and worshipped the Lord. Also Jesus, Annus, Sarabias, Iadinus, Jacobus, Sabateus, Auteas, Maiannas, and Calitas, Azarias, and Jozabdu, and Ananias, Phalias, the Levites, taught the law of the Lord,

and read to the multitude the law of the Lord, making them withal to understand it. 49 Then said Attharates unto Esdras the chief priest and reader, and to the Levites that taught the multitude, even to all, This day is holy unto the Lord; (now they all wept when they heard the law:)

51 go then, and eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions to them that have nothing; for the day is holy unto the Lord: and be not sorrowful: for the Lord will bring you to honour.

53 So the Levites published all things to the people, saying, This day is holy: be not sorrowful. Then went they their way, every one to eat and drink, and make merry, and to give portions to them that had nothing, and to make great cheer: because they understood the words wherein they were instructed, and for the which they had been assembled.

baddanah, Zechariah, and Meshullam. And 5 Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people; (for he was above all the people;) and when he opened it, all the people stood up: and 6 Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God. And all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with the lifting up of their hands: and they bowed their heads, and worshipped the Lord with their faces to the ground. Also Jeshua, and Bani, and 7 Sherebiah, Jamin, Akkub, Shabbethai, Hodiah, Maaseiah, Kelita, Azariah, Jozabad, Hanan, Pelaiah, and the Levites, caused the people to understand the law: and the people stood in their place. And they read in the book, in the 8 law of God, distinctly; and they gave the sense, so that they understood the reading. And 9 Nehemiah, which was the Tirshatha, and Ezra the priest the scribe, and the Levites that taught the people, said unto all the people, This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep. For all the people wept, when they heard the words of the law. Then he said unto them, 10 Go your way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto him for whom nothing is prepared: for this day is holy unto our Lord: neither be ye grieved; for the joy of the Lord is your strength. So the Levites stilled all the 11 people, saying, Hold your peace, for the day is holy; neither be ye grieved. And all the 12 people went their way to eat, and to drink, and to send portions, and to make great mirth, because they had understood the words that were declared unto them.

And on the second day were gathered together . . . 13

46. \mathfrak{L} (but not \mathfrak{C}^1) transliterate the familiar יהוה צבאות, and add the paraphrase Παντοκράτωρ, omnipotentem (wanting in \mathfrak{L}^1). On the use of this paraphrase, see H. St. J. Thackeray, *Gram. of O.T. in Greek*, 9, and for the distribution of the term 'Lord of Hosts', see M. Löhr, *Buch Amos* (Beihft. to ZATW, 1901), 38 seqq.

47. Amen, \mathfrak{C}^1 \mathfrak{S} + Amen, cf. N.

48. The teachers are Levites, cf. 2 Chron. xvii, 8 seq., and contrast N and. On the forms in E see E. Bl.; Annus is apparently a corruption of Banaias.

and read . . . Lord, \mathfrak{C}^1 \mathfrak{L} om.

The texts are confused, see N \mathfrak{C} .

49. In N, some read 'and N and E', omitting 'which was the Tirshatha' (Smend, Stade, Wellh., Nikel, &c., cf. \mathfrak{C}^{100} \mathfrak{S}); others omit 'N which was' (Fr., Schlatter, Guthe, Torrey, &c.); and yet others read simply 'and E', omitting all reference to N (Meyer, 200 n. 3; Howorth, *PSBA*, xxv, 15 seq.; Berth., Jahn, Davies). The difficulty caused by the presence of N or of an unnamed Tirshatha makes it still more difficult to remove it by simple excision. The identification of N and the Tirshatha, even if a gloss, expresses a plausible view (cf. N x. 1); and its omission in E may be due to the presence of the passage before N i. seqq. (cf. Meyer, 200 n. 3). N and especially E may seem to give the Tirshatha undue prominence, but this may be supported by v. 40, N vii. 70 this giftsi, and the position of the governor Bagohi in the Sachau papyri.

52. honour, הדרה, 'joy', misread הדרה (Ball).

53. published, ἐδέξαν, an error for ἐλάλω, or שָׁטַח ('stilled') read as שָׁטַח.

55. understood, mg. were inspired by; ἐνεπνεύσθησαν (cf. John xii. 22); cf. 7. 48 ἐμφανισθέντες ἅμα τῇ ἀπίσταντι.

and for the which . . . This conceals the abruptness of \mathfrak{C} : καὶ ἐπειροσθήσαν. N \mathfrak{C} reads καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρῃ τῇ δευτέρῃ συνέχ., but E, which handles the MT more freely (cf. the dates in viii. 62, ix. 37), probably placed the date after the verb. Bayer's explanation (50 seq.) seems too artificial. \mathfrak{C}^1 cites the whole of N 13. \mathfrak{L} reads: et coadunati (congregati) sunt omnes (universi) in Ier. iocundari (celebrare laetitiam) secundum dispositionem (testamentum) Domini dei Israel; \mathfrak{L}^2 + explicit Esdrae liber primus de templi restitutione. Jos., whose treatment of the story of E is free and summary, proceeds to refer to the feast of tabernacles (N viii. 16 seqq.), the return of the people to their homes, the death of the aged E, and his burial in Jerusalem contemporary with the death of the high-priest Joiakim and the succession of Eliashib (cf. N xii. 10). He then gives a summary of the labours of N, either an extremely arbitrary version or else based upon another recension (xi. 5-8). N, hearing of the desolation and captivity, returns with a band of exiles in the 25th year of Xerxes (cf. N i.-ii. 9). He appeals to the people (cf. ii. 17 seq.) and the work of

I ESDRAS

rebuilding is distributed (cf. iii.). Ammon, Moab, Samaria, and Coele Syria are hostile, but the walls (evidently begun in the 5th month, cf. vi. 15) are completed in 2 years 4 months, in the 9th month of the 28th year of Xerxes (N v. is ignored). The walls are dedicated (cf. xii. 27 seqq.) and there is a feast of eight days. The surrounding peoples are enraged at the completion of the building (cf. vi. 16). The population of the city is augmented (cf. vii. 4, xi.), and arrangements are made for the priests and Levites (cf. xii. 44, xiii. 10-13). N dies an old man, and the walls of the city are his eternal monument (cf. Ben Sira, xlix. 13). Next follows the story of Esther (xi. 6), and the Samaritan schism (cf. N xiii.) is placed at the close of the Persian age (xi. 7, 8). Thus Jos. does not testify to the present fragmentary condition of *E*; he treats the life of *E* independently of and before that of N, and his points of agreement with the MT make his divergences the more significant.

A Syriac Catena (Brit. Mus. Add. 12168), representing a text of the seventh cent., illustrates the relationship between *E* and the MT in an interesting manner. It uses 1 and 2 Chron., '1 Ezra' (i.e. *E*), '2 Ezra' (i.e. N) and Daniel; *E* is said to be 'according to the tradition of the Seventy (i.e. the Septuagint)'. It passes from 2 Chron. xxxv. 20-25 to *E* ii. 1-15, 16, 24-30, iv. 35^b-36, 38-40, 49-57, v. 47-73, vi. 1-2, vii. 6-15, viii. 1-26, 68-72, 91-6, ix. 1-10, 46^b-47. Then follow N i. 1-4 a, ii. 1-8, iv. 1-3, 10-16, vi. 15-16, vii. 73^b-viii. 18, ix. 1-3 (the references are to the R.V.). This removal of the Reading of the Law appears to be a compromise between *E* (note the retention of ix. 46^b-47) and the MT of N. But there is some evidence that *E* may have had another sequel, and that it or a following book may have treated the life of *E* and of N on other lines (cf. H. Bloch, *Quellen d. Fl. Jos.*, 1879, p. 79 seq.). Thus according to Justin Mart. (*Dial. Tryph.* lxxv) an account of the passover celebrated by *E* was among the passages cancelled by the Jews. The passage quoted recurs in Lactantius (*Inst.* iv. 18): 'Apud Esdras ita scriptum est: Et dixit Esdras ad populum: Hoc pascha Salvator noster est, et refugium nostrum, cogitate et ascendat (Just. καὶ εἰς διασηθῆτε καὶ ἀναβῆτε) in cor uestrum, quoniam habemus humiliare eum in signo (Just. ὅτι μέλλομεν αὐτὸν ταπεινῶς ἐν σημείῳ), et post haec sperabimus (but *Épit.* xlvi. -*scimus*) in eum, ne deseratur (J. ἰρημοθή) hic locus in aeternum tempus (J. πάντα χρόνον), dicit Dominus Deus virtutum (λέγει ὁ θεὸς τῶν δικαίων [= תיאצו הוה]). Si non credideritis ei neque exaudieritis annuntiationem eius, eritis derisio (ἐπίχαρμα) in gentibus.'

The quotation may be compared generally with the spirit of *E*'s prayers (*E* ix., N ix.). It can hardly be based upon *E* viii. 35, which recalls the sacrifices at the dedication of the Temple by Zerubbabel (vi. 17) mentioned before the celebration of the passover by the 'children of the captivity' (vi. 19 seqq.). Elsewhere the chronicler deals at length with the passover celebrated by Hezekiah and Josiah (2 Chron. xxx., xxxv.), in each case after a restoration or reform of the Temple, and 2 Chron. xxx. 6-9 illustrate the importance attached to the celebration. It is very noteworthy, also, that the Latin Lucca Synopsis (Lag. 18 seqq.), after using *E* iii. seqq., combines the return of Zerubbabel with that of *E* (using *E* viii.) and asserts that the passover was celebrated on reaching Jerusalem. Moreover, a Greek synopsis of 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras (= N) testifies to *E*'s passover. According to 1 *E*, Jeshua, *E* and Zer. were the three youths of *E* iii. seqq., and the statement of the return is followed immediately by the notice that the builders were Zer., Jeshua and N; *E* brings the law, reads it, casts out the foreign wives and the people observe the passover and a fast. As for 2 *E*: ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ τὰ ἀπὸ μὲν τῶ πρώτῳ λέγει *E*. περὶ τῆς ἐπιπέδου χωρὶς τῶν προσηλθόντων. But it is chiefly concerned with 'N, the cunuch' and his building of the Temple. *E* reads the law and celebrates the passover, and in the seventh month there is a fast and the Feast of Tabernacles. *E* then notices the foreign marriages (Ashdodite women are mentioned, see N xiii. 23) and persuades the people to promise to observe the law and expel the women. They swear to keep the law and after being cleansed rejoice and depart each to his own home (Lag. *Sept. Stud.* ii. 84). It seems clear from the foregoing evidence that the form of the narrative whether in the present *E* N or in *E* was not the only one extant. See further, *Introd.*, p. 17.